



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 449597

THE
PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY
OF
PROFESSOR GEORGE S. MORRIS,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY,

1870-1889.

Presented to the University of Michigan.

BT
111
. B97

30898

**TESTIMONIES
OF THE
ANTE-NICENE FATHERS
TO THE DOCTRINE OF
THE TRINITY
AND OF THE
DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.**

—
BY
THE REV. EDWARD BURTON, D. D.
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

—
**OXFORD,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.**

MDCCXXXI.

INTRODUCTION.

IT is unnecessary to state, that the present work is intimately connected with one which has been already published, entitled, *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*. The two works might not improperly have been incorporated, and the whole would have formed a body of Ante-Nicene testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity. I preferred however making a distinct collection of all the passages, which assert a belief in Christ's divinity: and I had intended to follow this up by a similar collection of quotations concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost. It is known to the readers of ecclesiastical history, that there was no specific controversy concerning the third person of the Trinity till the fourth century. It might not be incorrect to say, that till then the divinity of the third person was never doubted or denied: but however this may be, the absence of controversy might prepare us for few passages, which bear directly upon this subject; and I have therefore thought it better to bring together in the present work all the testimonies which remain, whether they relate to the doctrine of the Trinity, or the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The doctrine of the Trinity is in fact established by any passages, which prove the divinity of the second and third persons: and by the doctrine of the Trinity, I mean the doctrine of there being three distinct persons, each of whom is God, but all of whom, when considered as to their substance or essence, are only one God. I am not now explaining the nature of this mystery, but merely stating what is meant by the doctrine of the Trinity, as it has been held by the catholic church from the earliest ages to the present; and I repeat, that this doctrine is established by any passages, which prove the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost.

If this position be denied, we have no alternative between adopting the Arian or Sabellian hypothesis, or acknowledging a plurality of Gods. The Arians professed to believe, that Jesus Christ is God: they even called him very God of very God: but then they used the term *God* in a different sense, when applied to the Son, from what it bears, when applied to the Father. They believed that there was a time, when the Son did not exist: they believed him to have been created by the Father: and by this twofold meaning of the term *God*, they avoided the charge of holding a plurality of Gods, while they also differed totally from the orthodox faith. The Arians however can hardly be rescued with truth from acknowledging more Gods than one. They did not acknowledge two Gods in the same sense of the expression; but there were two Beings of a

different nature, to whom they applied the same term *God*: and if they are to be acquitted of the charge of polytheism, the same indulgence may be extended to the heathen, who believed Jupiter to be God in a different sense from their deified heroes.

The Arian creed, if considered in all its bearings and deductions, will perhaps appear much less rational and philosophical, than has been sometimes asserted. It has been described as a simpler and less mystical hypothesis, than that of the Trinitarians: and yet it requires us to apply the same term *God* to two Beings, who differ as widely from each other, as the Creator and his creature. It requires us to speak of Christ, as *the begotten Son of God*, though he only differs from all other creatures by having preceded them in the order of time. It requires us to believe of this created Being, that he was himself employed in creating the world; and to invest him with every attribute of Deity, except that of having existed from all eternity. If we contrast these notions with the creed of the Trinitarians, they will be found to present still greater difficulties to our faculties of comprehension: but the Arian hypothesis, whatever may be decided concerning it, confirms very strongly the fact, which I am endeavouring to establish, that the notion of Christ being a mere man was not held in early times. If the Fathers were unanimous in speaking of him as God, they could not have believed him to

be a mere man in the sense of the modern Unitarians.

It will be conceded, that they did not mean to speak as polytheists: and many passages were adduced in my former work, as well as in the present, which are sufficient to shew that they were not Arians. They expressly denied, that there was a time, when the Son did not exist; and they as expressly asserted him to be of one substance with the Father. These were the two tests, which were always applied to persons suspected of Arianism; and if they are applied to the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, they will be found to remove them altogether from the suspicion of Arianism.

There are also many other expressions in their writings, (beside those which assert the eternity and consubstantiality of the Son,) by which we might argue that they could not have agreed with the sentiments of Arius. Such are all those passages, in which they speak of the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son; of the Son being one with the Father; and of Christ being the begotten Son of God. These expressions are of frequent occurrence in Ante-Nicene writings, and many instances may be found in this and my former work. Any one of them, as I conceive, is sufficient to prove, by legitimate and necessary inference, the doctrine of the Trinity. We will take the assertion of Christ being *the begotten Son* of God. The words *begotten Son* are either to be interpreted

literally or figuratively. If they are taken figuratively, they may merely mean, that Christ was beloved by God ; that he was God's minister or messenger, like any other of the prophets, but that he received preeminent tokens of love and affection from God ^a. It is in a sense somewhat similar to this, and evidently in a figurative sense, that all Christians are called *sons of God*, and even said *to be begotten by God*. But if Christ is the Son of God merely in this figurative sense, as being an adopted Son, the epithet of *only begotten* could not apply to him : for upon this hypothesis all Christians are equally begotten sons of God ; and therefore the term *μονογενὴς*, *only begotten*, must lead us to infer, that Christ is the *Son of God* in a different sense from those, who are called *sons* by adoption. Christians are made sons by adoption ; Christ is the only Son, who is begotten by God.

^a The word *μονογενὴς*, *only begotten*, is applied to Christ five times by St. John : (John i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9.) and in each case the Unitarian translators have rendered it *only son*. Mr. Lindsey observes, that “*only begotten* is “most gross and improper language to be used in English, “especially with respect to “Deity :” (List of Wrong Translations, p. 46.) to which it is obvious to reply, that the grossness or impropriety of the expression is not the question :

St. John was as good a judge of this as Mr. Lindsey ; and if *only begotten* is improper in English, *μονογενὴς* is equally improper in Greek ; for *μονογενὴς* can have no other meaning than *only begotten* ; and if we translate it *only*, we must still mean *only begotten*. The use of the term in Luke vii. 12, ix. 38. leaves no room for doubt : and when it is applied to Isaac, (Heb. xi. 17.) it evidently means, that Isaac was the *only son* of Abraham, *begotten* of Sarah.

This distinction between begotten and adopted sons seems clearly marked in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Moses is said to have been faithful *as a servant*, but Christ *as a Son*. (iii. 5, 6.) There are also passages in the New Testament, where the argument is wholly illogical and inconsecutive, if we do not understand Christ to be the begotten Son of God, according to the analogy of human fathers and human sons. Thus in the parable of the householder and his vineyard, (Matt. xxi. 33—39,) the words, *they will reverence my son, and this is the heir*, require us to make a marked difference between *the son*, i. e. Jesus Christ, and *the servants*, i. e. all other prophets and teachers. The son in the parable is literally a begotten son, and the application of the parable requires us to believe the same of Jesus Christ. So also when St. Paul says, *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* (Rom. viii. 32.) the inference is not true, that God will certainly *give us all things*, if we understand by *his own Son* a mere human prophet or teacher, whom God sent into the world, and permitted to be put to death. Though it was an act of mercy on the part of God to send such a teacher, and we might perhaps infer from one such act of mercy, that others might be expected, yet we should not be justified in arguing, that God would therefore freely give us all things. The argument would then be *a minori ad majus*, and would not

be consecutive. But if God literally spared not his begotten Son, but delivered him up for us all, we may then argue *a majori ad minus*, that God will freely give us all things^b; for there is nothing, which can be so dear to God as his own begotten Son.

Having thus attempted to shew from the plain words of scripture, that Christ is literally the begotten Son of God, I shall not proceed to consider the mode of the divine generation, but merely to remark, that human language must be interpreted according to the analogy of human ideas. We know what is the relation of father and son, when we are speaking of men; and the scripture tells us to apply the same analogy to the relation which subsists between God and Jesus Christ. But since our ideas do not allow us to conceive of a son, that he is of a different nature from his father, we are compelled to form the same conception of God and his Son: both of them must be of the same nature; and since the Father is God, the Son, who is begotten by him, must be likewise God.

I was led into these remarks by considering the

^b I follow our version, which translates τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται, *he will freely give us all things*: but the words may perhaps mean, *he will freely forgive us every thing*. Χαρίζεσθαι has this sense in Eph. iv. 32. Col. ii. 13; iii. 13; and it is perfectly just to argue,

that God will forgive us all our sins, if it was *his own Son* who made atonement for them; but the expectation would not be well grounded, if God merely sent a human teacher to instruct us in our duty, and to prove his sincerity by his death.

INTRODUCTION.

expressions in the writings of the Fathers, which speak of Christ as the begotten Son of God. The modern Unitarians interpret these expressions figuratively, and so did the Arians in the fourth century; but both of them came to very different conclusions. The Arians believed Christ to be a created God: the Unitarians believe him to be a mere human being; and these opposite conclusions perhaps furnish a strong reason against having recourse to figurative interpretations. The orthodox party, or the Athanasians, as they have been termed in contempt, did not seek to be wise above what is written, but interpreted the words of Scripture literally: they believed that Christ is really the begotten Son of God: and this belief, as I have already observed, requires us to acknowledge the Son to be of the same nature with his Father, and therefore to be verily and truly God.

We are brought to the same conclusion by considering those expressions, which speak of the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son. It is true, that we read in the New Testament of God and His Son dwelling in all believers: and all Christians are said to be one with the Father and the Son: hence it has been contended that Christ is one with the Father in the same sense that all Christians may be said to be one with God. The reader will judge from the following quotations, whether this was the sense in which the Ante-Nicene writers spoke of the unity of the Father and the Son. I

would refer particularly to N^o. 1, 11, 12, 18, 25, 45, 50, 51, 57, 63, 64, 70, in all of which places we find assertions of this mysterious union: and if it should be decided, that the Fathers would not have spoken of God being thus united with any created being, we are again brought to the conclusion, that the Son is God, of the same nature with the Father.

I have said above, that if we do not admit the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, we must suppose the Fathers, when they spoke of the Son and the Holy Ghost as God, to have adopted either the Arian or Sabellian hypothesis. I have given reasons for concluding that the Fathers were not Arians: and though their expressions concerning the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, have been explained in the Sabellian sense, such an explanation can only be given by persons, who have not studied the Fathers. The Sabellian hypothesis removes some of the difficulties in the doctrine of the Trinity, but it does not remove the whole of them, and it creates new difficulties of its own. It saves us from enquiring into the mode of the divine generation, and simplifies the notion of the unity of God: but it fails to explain, why the Apostles constantly used such figurative language; and why God is spoken of as being Son to Himself. It assigns no reason, why God should be called the Son, when viewed as the Redeemer of mankind; and the notion of the Son interceding with the Father, of his having made satisfaction to his Father, and of

his being a mediator between God and man, must lead us to the notion of two Beings, who in some way or other have distinct individuality. That Sabellianism, when it appeared in the third century, was looked upon as a heresy, is not a matter of speculation, but of history. It was the creed of a party, which was not inconsiderable in numbers, but it was not the creed of the church. The sentiments of Tertullian, Novatian, Origen, and Dionysius, would alone be sufficient to prove this point. They refute the Sabellian hypothesis, not merely by inference or incidentally, but in writings expressly directed against the defenders of it: and the Index to this and my former work will furnish many passages, which prove that the Fathers were not Sabellians.

We are again therefore brought to the same conclusion, that if the Fathers spoke of the Son and the Holy Ghost as God, and if they did not use the term God in the Arian or Sabellian sense, they must have used it in the sense which it bore at the time of the council of Nice. That the Fathers were not Socinians or Unitarians, is, I conceive, capable of demonstration to every reasonable and unprejudiced mind. I have always admitted, and am still ready to admit, that the testimony of the Fathers is not infallible. They were liable to error like ourselves, and in some points they erred exceedingly. But let those persons, who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, declare plainly and openly what are their

sentiments upon this point. Let them not appeal to the Fathers, as agreeing with themselves, and then, when they are driven from this ground, attempt to depreciate the Fathers as unworthy of the appeal. The first question for enquiry is whether the writers of the first three centuries were unanimous; whether one uniform system of belief concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost can be extracted from their writings, or whether they opposed and contradicted each other. Even if we should adopt the latter conclusion, it would by no means follow, that they held the Socinian or Unitarian notions. Pains have been taken to rescue some of them from an inclination to Arianism; and the present work may shew whether the attempt has not been successful; but there is not even a shadow of proof, that any one of these writers approached to the Socinian or Unitarian tenets. It will however be seen, that the Fathers of the first three centuries were perfectly unanimous. There are no signs of doubt or dissension in any of their writings. Some of them were engaged in controversy, while others merely illustrated scripture, or applied themselves to practical theology. In all of them we find the same uniform mode of expression concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost. The testimony is collected with equal plainness from the casual and incidental remark, as from the laboured conclusion of the apologist and the polemic.

The next question is respecting the doctrine,

which was thus unanimously maintained. Upon this subject it does not become me prematurely to decide. The reader will draw his own inference, when he has read the testimonies, which are collected from the writers themselves: but if he should perceive in them an uniform and unvarying agreement with the doctrines which are now held in the catholic church concerning the Trinity, I must repeat the observation, which was made in my former work, that the belief of those Christians, who lived in the earliest times, was most likely to be genuine and apostolical. I have not seen any reason to alter or abandon this opinion. It is one which seems to be founded upon the most rational and natural principles: and until some argument is advanced, which will account for all these primitive Christians being in error, we may be content to believe them to have been right: and when we also find them agreeing perfectly with ourselves, we are perhaps not reasoning unphilosophically or presumptuously, if we see in the unanimous testimony of these writers a powerful and convincing support to the opinions, which we ourselves maintain. Whatever may be thought of the execution of the present work, the intention at least was honest: and that man has read the Fathers with very different feelings from myself, who does not thank God for having preserved to these latter days the light of purer times.

In my former work I mentioned the names of other writers, who had partly traversed the same

field: and I said that the treatise most nearly resembling my own in its design was that written by Burgh, entitled, *An Enquiry into the Belief of the Christians of the first three Centuries respecting the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. I had not then read much of the controversy, out of which this work of Burgh arose: and I may state that the first publication was *The Apology of Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire*. London, 1774. Mr. Lindsey resigned his preferment upon the adoption of Unitarian tenets: and his Apology called forth *A Scriptural Confutation of the Arguments against the Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. By a Layman. London, 1774. This Layman was Mr. Burgh: and there appeared at the same time *A Vindication of the Doctrine and Liturgy of the Church of England, occasioned by the Apology of Theophilus Lindsey, M.A.* By George Bingham, B. D. Oxford, 1774. This was followed by *A Vindication of the Worship of the Son and the Holy Ghost against the exceptions of Mr. Theophilus Lindsey from Scripture and Antiquity*. By Thomas Randolph, D. D. President of C. C. C. and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity. Oxford, 1775. About the same time appeared *Remarks on a late Publication, entitled "A Scriptural Confutation, &c."* London, 1775: and soon after Mr. Lindsey published *A Sequel to the Apology on resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire*. London, 1776.

Dr. Randolph then replied in *A Letter to the Remarker on the Layman's Scriptural Confutation, wherein the Divinity of the Son of God is farther vindicated against the Remarker's Exceptions: to which is added an Appendix, taking some notice of Mr. Lindsey's Sequel.* Oxford, 1777. Last of all, Mr. Burgh published the work which I have already mentioned, *An Inquiry into the Belief of the Christians of the first three Centuries, respecting the one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* York, 1778. There were other works connected with this controversy; and in those which I have mentioned, the reader will find copious references to the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

I have also met with another work, which was before unknown to me, entitled ΤΠΙΩΤΤΠΙΩΣΙΣ, sive *Catholicæ circa S. S. Trinitatem fidei delineatio, ex scriptis Patrum Ante-Nicænorum desumpta.* Londini, 1677. The author was Dr. Samuel Gardiner; and the design, as may be seen from the title, was very similar to that of the present work. I am not aware, that any important passage, which is adduced by Dr. Gardiner, has been omitted by myself: but his work, which is written in Latin, is so deficient in arrangement, and so little is added to connect or illustrate the quotations, that the obscurity, into which it has fallen, is by no means surprising.

There is another work with the following title, which I have not yet seen: *Testimonies from the*

Writers of the first four Centuries to the Divinity of Christ: by Knowles. London, 1789 : and since the publication of my former work there has appeared *Fides Nicæna de Filio Dei, sanctorum Patrum atque Doctorum, qui tribus primis sæculis floruerunt, traditione confirmata.* H. G. Vogelsang. Coloniæ, 1829. It is a very short work, and does not give many original passages.

LIST OF EDITIONS

REFERRED TO IN THIS WORK.

	A. D.		
Ignatius	107.	{ Patres Apostolici Cotelieri. Amste- }	p. 1.
Polycarpus	108.	{ lædami. 2 vol. fol. 1724. }	p. 4.
Justin Martyr	150.	{ Editio Benedictina. Hagæ Comitum. }	p. 15.
Athenagoras	170.	{ fol. 1742. }	p. 28.
Theophilus	180.	{ Editio Benedictina. Massuet. Paris. }	p. 33.
Irenæus	185.	{ fol. 1710. }	p. 47.
Clemens Alex.	194.	Potter. Oxonii. fol. 1715.	p. 54.
Tertullianus	200.	Priorii. Paris. fol. 1675.	p. 60.
Hippolytus	220.	Fabricii. Hamb. 2 vol. fol. 1716, 18.	p. 84.
Origenes	240.	{ Ed. Benedict. Delarue. 4 vol. fol. }	p. 87.
Cyprianus	250.	{ Paris. 1733-59. }	p. 107.
Novatianus.	257.	Ed. Benedict. fol. Paris. 1726.	p. 116.
Dionysius Alex.	260.	{ Ad finem operum Tertull.	
Dionysius Rom.	260.	{ Simonis de Magistris. fol. Romæ, }	p. 123.
Concil. Antioch.	269.	{ 1796. }	
Theognostus.	283.	{ Apud Athanas. l. c. et Routh. Rel. }	p. 127.
		{ Sacr. III. p. 176. }	
		Apud Routh. Rel. Sacr. II. p. 463.	p. 132.
		Apud Athanas. l. c.	p. 133.

TESTIMONIES
OF THE
ANTE-NICENE FATHERS
TO
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY
AND OF THE
DIVINITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.

IGNATIUS, A. D. 107.

Ignatii Epist. ad Magnesianos, §. 7. p. 19.

THE first passage, which I shall quote, is from Ignatius, who exhorts the Magnesians to unity, by saying, “As the Lord did nothing, either by himself or his apostles, without the Father, being united with him; so do you also do nothing without the bishop and elders^a. ” Ἡνωμένος is a strong expression, as denoting the *unity* of the Father and the Son; and would hardly, as I conceive, have been applied to any union, which might be said to have existed between God and Moses, or any other prophet. It may be said, perhaps, that Ignatius only intended an unity of purpose or action; and that he shews this by proceeding to speak of the unity between the different members of the church. If this be so, the testimony is not strong

^a Οσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄγεν τοῦ στόλων, οὔτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἄγεν τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησε, ἡνωμένος ὅν, ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲ δι' αὐτοῦ, οὔτε διὰ τῶν ἀπόδεν πράσσετε.

in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity: but the concluding words of the same chapter are very remarkable, and it is difficult in a translation to express the intimate union and mutual indwelling, which Ignatius seems to have intended: “All of “you therefore come together to one temple of God, “to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded “from one Father, and in that one exists and is “contained^b.” The last words, *εἰς ἔνα ὅντα καὶ χωρήσαντα*, may remind us of many expressions of the later fathers, and of the doctrine which spoke of the *περιχώρησις* or *circuminsessio* of the Father and Son, and which bishop Bull explains by “*unio rerum sese invicem usquequaque immeantium*^c.” I shall have occasion to speak of this doctrine more at length hereafter; and at present I shall only compare the passage in Ignatius with the following words of Dionysius of Rome, who wrote in the third century: “The divine Word must be united “with the God of the universe; and the Holy “Ghost must reciprocally pass into and dwell in “God.” The expressions *ἡμένος*, *εἰς ἔνα ὅντα*, and *χωρήσαντα*, of Ignatius, agree with *ἡνῶσθαι* and *ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν* of Dionysius; and there can be no doubt, that the latter writer used them in the sense of a modern Trinitarian, as may be seen in №. 71, where the whole passage is quoted.

2. *Ignatii Epist. ad Smyrnæos*, §. 3. p. 35.

We find a similar expression as to the unity of the Father and the Son in the following passage:

^b Πάντες οὖν ὡς εἰς ἔνα γαδὺ συντρέχετε Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς ἐπὶ ἔνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν αὐτὸν Πατρὸς προελθόντα, καὶ εἰς

^c Def. Fid. Nic. IV. 4. 14. See the Index to Bull's Works, v. *περιχώρησις*.

“ After his resurrection he ate and drank with them, “ as a person having a body, although he was spiritually united to (or one with) the Father ^d. ” These words prove the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, if they do not also prove the hypostatical union of the Father and the Son.

Such were the expressions used by Ignatius, who had conversed with the apostles, and wrote at the beginning of the second century. We may suppose also, that there was some traditional notion of his having held the doctrine of the Trinity, from the following passage in Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, who tells us, “ that the custom of singing “ anthems (*τοὺς ἀντιφόνους ὑμνούς*) in the church began in this way. Ignatius, the third bishop of Antioch after the apostle Peter, who had also lived with the apostles themselves, saw a vision “ of angels, who answered each other in singing “ hymns to the holy Trinity^e, and he caused the church of Antioch to preserve by tradition the method which he had observed in this vision : “ from whence also the tradition has spread among all churches.” Socrates wrote in the fifth century, and is the earliest writer, who has noticed this anecdote in the life of Ignatius. It may perhaps be rejected, as not worthy of credit : but it must at least be supposed, that a tradition of this kind was preserved at Antioch : and the persons, who first invented the story, could not have seen any thing in the writings of Ignatius, which made it improbable.

^d Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συκέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καὶ περ ἀνευματικῶς ἐνομένος τῷ πατρὶ.

^e Ὁπτασίαν εἶδεν ἀγγέλων, διὰ τῶν ἀντιφόνων ὑμνον τὴν ἀγίαν Τρίδα ὑμνούντων. Hist. Eccl. VI. 8.

It should be added however, in fairness, that the passage does not necessarily mean, that Ignatius received the doctrine of the Trinity from angels, but that he heard angels singing hymns to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the three persons who were described, in the time of Socrates, by the name of the Trinity. The value of this testimony must depend upon the antiquity of the tradition ; and that cannot now be ascertained.

POLYCARPUS, A. D. 108.

In my Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, I did not give any particular account of Polycarp, because no passage was alleged from his writings, though his name was incidentally mentioned in that work, and some facts were alluded to in connexion with his history. The most valuable information concerning him is that furnished by Irenæus, who tells us that he had seen him, and adds, “ He had not only been instructed “ by the apostles, and had lived with many who “ had seen Christ, but had been appointed to the “ bishopric of Smyrna by the apostles^f. ” Polycarp was a very old man, when Irenæus saw him ; and the expression used by himself, of “ having served “ Christ eighty-six years^g, ” is generally taken to mean, that then, at the time of his death, he was eighty-six years old. The time of his death has been fixed at different periods. Eusebius placed it in 167 : and the latest date assigned to it is in 175 : but Pearson has advanced some strong arguments for supposing it to have happened in 147^h. Ac-

^f III. 3, 4. p. 176. ^g Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* IV. 15. p. 167.
^h Op. Posthum. Chronol. Diss. II. c. 14, &c.

cording to this notion he was born about the year 61, or five or six years before the death of St. Peter and St. Paul : and since there is reason to believe, that most of the apostles died soon after that period, we are probably to restrict the expression of Irenæus to Polycarp having lived with St. John, and having been appointed by that apostle to the bishopric of Smyrna. If these words of Irenæus are in any sense to be taken literally, Polycarp must have been bishop of Smyrna before the death of St. John, who was the last surviving apostle : and if St. John wrote his Apocalypse but a short time before his death, we can hardly avoid concluding, that *the angel of the church in Smyrna*, addressed in ii. 8, was Polycarp ; and such was the opinion of Usher and several learned men. Irenæus speaks of Polycarp having gone to Rome, when Anicetus was bishop of that see : and Eusebius supplies the additional fact, that he went thither on account of the dispute between the eastern and western churches concerning the time of celebrating Easterⁱ. Pearson and Dodwell suppose Anicetus to have held the see from 142 to 161 ; which will enable us nearly to fix the date of Polycarp's arrival in Rome, if we also adopt the notion of Pearson, that he suffered martyrdom in 147. The two bishops could not come to any agreement, since both of them urged ancient, if not apostolical authority for the customs of their respective churches. It is pleasing however to read, that the conference was carried on amicably ; and writers of the church of Rome have been perplexed to find it said, that when the two bishops were in the church together, Anicetus allowed Polycarp, as a mark of

ⁱ Hist. Eccl. IV. 14. p. 160. V. 24. p. 249.

honour, to consecrate the eucharist. Polycarp is stated, during this visit to Rome, to have brought back to the church many heretics, who had embraced the tenets of Valentinus and Marcion : and Irenæus informs us, that meeting one day with Marcion himself, who said to him, “Do you recognise me?” he replied, “I recognise the firstborn of Satan.”

The martyrdom of Polycarp took place in the amphitheatre of Smyrna, in the presence of the pro-consul : and a most interesting account of it was written by the Christians in that city, and sent to the other churches. Eusebius has preserved part of this letter in his Ecclesiastical History, (IV. 15,) and the whole of it was published by archbishop Usher in 1647. We have the authority of Irenæus for the fact of Polycarp having written many epistles : but only one genuine work of this kind has come down to us, which was addressed to the Christians at Philippi. It was published for the first time in Latin by J. Faber Stapulensis in 1498, and in Greek by Peter Halloix in the first volume of his Lives of Oriental Writers, p. 525, in 1633. A fuller and more perfect copy of it was printed by archbishop Usher in 1644.

3. *Epistola Ecclesiae Smyrnensis de Martyrio Polycarpi.*

The testimony, which I adduce from the words of Polycarp, is not taken from his Epistle to the Philippians, but from the circular Epistle, which was written, as just stated, by the church at Smyrna : and I adduce it, as enabling me to say a few words concerning the form of the ancient doxologies.

The holy martyr, when he was fastened to the stake, and was about to surrender his soul to the

Master, whom he had faithfully served so many years, addressed Him in a solemn and affecting prayer, the last words of which were, “ For this “ and for every thing I praise thee, I bless thee, I “ glorify thee, together with the eternal and hea-“ venly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom “ to thee and the Holy Ghost be glory, both now “ and for evermore. Amen ^k.”

Such are the concluding words of the prayer in the edition of archbishop Usher: but Eusebius has quoted them differently, “ — I glorify thee, through “ the eternal High Priest Jesus Christ, thy beloved “ Son, through whom be glory to thee with him “ in the Holy Ghost, both now and for evermore. “ Amen ^l.” The difference between these two forms of expression appears considerable, and is connected in some measure with the Arian controversy: for it is well known, that the Arians, if they would have used the former doxology at all, would have greatly preferred the latter: and Usher seems to hint, that the genuine words of Polycarp may have been altered by a favourer of Arianism. The first of the two forms unites the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father, and ascribes equal glory to all the three persons: the second seems to place the Father above the two other persons, and by expressions which are not very distinct and intelligible, to glorify the Father *through* the Son and *in* the Holy Ghost. It was remarked so long ago as by Socrates in the

^k Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σε, εὐλογῶ σε, δοξάζω σε, σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, καὶ τοῖς μέλλοντας αἰώνας.

^l Διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός δὲ σὺ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Πνεύματι ἀγαπητῷ σου παιδί, μεθ' ὃ σὺ καὶ Ἀγίῳ δόξᾳ, καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς Πνεύματι Ἀγίῳ ἡ δόξα, καὶ νῦν καὶ μέλλοντας αἰώνας. p. 169.

fifth century, that one of the grounds for charging Eusebius with Arianism was taken from his using the phrase *through Christ* in his doxologies^m: and that such was his practice, may be seen in some of his works now extantⁿ. It is added however by Socrates, that the phrase was often used by orthodox writers: and bishop Bull observes, that the words *μεθ' οὐ* and *δι' οὐ*, *with whom* and *through whom*, occur in doxologies written before the council of Nice^o. “The early orthodox writers,” as bishop Bull goes on to remark, “while they glorified “the Father *through the Son*, intended to express “the subordination of the Son, in his relation of “Son, and the preeminence of the Father, in his “relation of Father: but by adoring the Son *toge-*
ther with the Father, they intended to express his “being of one substance and his existing in the “same divine essence and nature with the Father.” Basil also defends the expression, *through the Son, in the Holy Ghost*, as bearing an orthodox sense^p: and it may be stated generally, that both forms were used indifferently before the council of Nice; but the Arians after that time made a distinction, and glorified the Father, not *together with*, but *through* the Son. Theodoret informs us, that in the middle of the fourth century the clergy and people of Antioch were divided, some using the conjunction *and*, when they glorified the Son, (i. e. saying *and to the*

^m Hist. Eccles. II. 21. p. 105.

ⁿ See the last words of his Panegyrical Oration in Hist. Eccles. X. 4. p. 480.

^o Def. Fid. Nic. II. 3. 6. Justin Martyr says, *εὐλογοῦμεν τὰς ποιητὴς τῶν πάντων διὰ τοῦ Θίου αὐ-*

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ Πνεύ-

ματος τοῦ Ἀγίου. Apol. I. 67. p. 83. Irenaeus observes, “in “Deo omnipotente per Jesum “Christum offert ecclesia.” IV. 17, 6. p. 249.

^p De Sp. Sancto, c. I. in fin.

*Son,) and others applying the preposition *through* to the Son, and *in* to the Holy Ghost^q. This was the period, when the dispute concerning the form of doxology became general : and Philostorgius, the Arian historian, is speaking of the same time and place, when he says, “that Flavianus was the first “ person who used the words, *Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost*: for before his time some had said, *Glory to the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost*, which was “ the expression in most general use ; and others, “ *Glory to the Father in the Son and Holy Ghost*.” Nicephorus supplies us with still another form, *Glory to the Father and to the Son in the Holy Ghost*^s; which was probably adopted by those who wished to lower the divinity of the third person in the Trinity. Philostorgius is undoubtedly wrong, when he says, that Flavianus was the inventor of the first of these forms, *Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost*. In the passage, which I shall quote at length from Clement of Alexandria, in N°. 20, thanks are offered “to the Father and to “ the Son with the Holy Ghost:” Hippolytus also says, after speaking of the Son, “to him be glory “ and power with the Father and Holy Ghost in “ the holy church both now and for ever^t.” Dionysius of Alexandria concludes one of his works with the following words, “To God the Father, and to “ the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy “ Ghost, be glory and power for ever and ever^u;”*

^q Hist. Eccles. II. 24. p. 106. ἀγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰώνας τὸν αἰώνων. Cont.

^r III. 13. p. 495-6. Noëtum, §. ult. p. 20.

^s Hist. Eccles. IX. 24. p. 737.

^t Αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος ἄμα οὐ Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ Τιῷ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Αγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ

having prefaced this doxology by saying, “ I con-
 “ clude what I have now written to you, in accord-
 “ ance with all this, and *having received the form*
 “ *and rule from the old persons who have preceded*
 “ *us, and expressing my thankfulness in words*
 “ *which agree with theirs.*” But a form of equal
 force, as implying the equality of the three persons,
 had been used much earlier by Polycarp, where the
 phrase $\mu\epsilon\theta'$ $\bar{o}\bar{v}$, *with whom*, can only imply, that equal
 or the same glory was to be ascribed to the Son as
 to the Father and the Holy Ghost. Basil, in the
 treatise already quoted^x, expressly says, that “ the
 “ church recognises both forms, and rejects neither
 “ of them, as destructive of the other——The form,
 “ *with whom*, is proper when we are ascribing glory;
 “ the form, *through whom*, when we are giving
 “ thanks. But it is false, that the phrase, *with*
 “ *whom*, is foreign from the practice of persons of
 “ piety; for as many as are led by steadiness of
 “ character to prefer a venerable antiquity to no-
 “ vety, and have preserved the uncorrupted tradi-
 “ tion of the fathers in different countries and cities,
 “ make use of this phrase^y.” And in another place
 he speaks of the received doxology as one, “ which
 “ has come to us from the fathers, which we find
 “ continuing by an undesigned uniformity of custom
 “ in those churches which are uncorrupted^z.” He
 afterwards speaks more in detail of the early writers,
 who had used the doxology, *to the Father and the*
Son, or, to the Father with the Son. He names
 Irenæus, Clement of Rome, Dionysius of Rome,

‘Αγίῳ Πνεύματι, δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς
 τοὺς αἰώνας τὸν αἰώνων. Op. p. 100.
 Apud Basil. de Sp. S. c. 29.

^x Cap. 29.

^y De Spir. S. c. 7.

^z Ibid. c. 27.

Dionysius of Alexandria, and Origen. He then quotes Africanus, who lived in the third century, as saying, “ We give thanks to the Father, who sent “ our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and “ majesty with the Holy Ghost for ever ^a. ” After which he observes, “ Whoever is acquainted with “ the hymn of Athenogenes, which he left as a fare-“ well-gift to his companions, when he was going “ to be burnt, will know what sentiments were held “ by the martyrs concerning the Spirit ^b. ” This hymn of Athenogenes is unfortunately lost: but Basil speaks of an evening hymn, which was in general use in his own day, (i. e. A. D. 370,) though he did not know the author of it: and the people, as he says, did not think that they were committing an impiety, when they joined in the words, “ We “ praise the Father, and Son, and holy Spirit of “ God ^c. ” This ancient evening hymn is probably extant: at least the Greek church still makes use of one, which contains the words quoted above by Basil, and which has sometimes been ascribed erroneously to Athenogenes. The hymn, as edited by Dr. Routh, is as follows:

“ O Jesus Christ, the joyous light of the blessed “ glory of the immortal Father, who is in heaven, “ holy and blessed, having come to the setting of “ the sun, having seen the evening light, we praise “ the Father, Son, and holy Spirit of God. Worthy

^a Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ παρασχομένῳ τοῖς ἱδίαις ἡμῖν Πατρὶ τὸν τῶν ὅλων σωτῆρα καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, δὲ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη σὺν Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τὸν αἰώνας. See Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* vol. II. p. 194.

^b Cave places Athenogenes A. D. 196. See *Act. Sanct. Jan.* 18. Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vol. V. p. 195.

^c Αἰνούμεν Πατέρα καὶ Τίτου καὶ ἄγιον Πνεύμα Θεοῦ.

“ art thou at all times to be praised by holy voices,
“ Son of God, who givest life: wherefore the world
“ glorifieth thee^d. ”

If this is the hymn alluded to by Basil, and which was so ancient, that he did not know the author of it, there are good grounds for giving it this place among the Ante-Nicene testimonies to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Basil then proceeds to pass a high eulogium upon Gregory, surnamed Thaumaturgus, who was bishop of Neocæsarea in Cappadocia, and flourished about A. D. 254. He does not quote any passage from his writings, but appeals to the notoriety of the fact, that the form of doxology, which was objected to by the heretics, had been constantly used in the church, because it was handed down from a man of such celebrity as Gregory. He says the same of Firmilianus, who was a bishop in the same country a few years earlier; and also of Meletius, whose name is omitted by Cave, but who is evidently the same person mentioned by Athanasius^e, as being present at the council of Nice.

I might perhaps have been excused, if I had translated the whole of this passage, which contains such an interesting assemblage of Ante-Nicene tes-

^d Φῶς ἵλαρὸν ἀγίας δόξης ἀθανάτου Πατρὸς, οὐρανίου, ἀγίου, μάκαρος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ· ἐλόντες ἐπὶ τῷ ἥλιον δύσιν, ἰδόντες φῶς ἑσπεριὸν, ὑμνοῦμεν Πατέρα καὶ Τίλον καὶ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ. “Ἄξιος εἶ ἐν πᾶσι: καιροῖς ὑμεῖσθαι φωνῆς δόξαις, Τίλε Θεοῦ, ζῶν ὁ διδοὺς” διὸ ὁ κόσμος σε δοξάζει. Rel. Sacr. vol. III. p. 298. Dr. Routh feels no doubt as to the Ante-Nicene antiquity of this hymn. It was published

by Smith in his *Miscellanea*, p. 151; and by Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vol. V. p. 196.

^e Epist. ad Episc. Aegypt. 8. p. 278. He is mentioned by Eusebius as bishop of a church in Pontus: (H. E. VII. ult.) and according to Philostorgius, he was bishop of Sebastopolis. (lib. I. p. 478.) See Valesius ad Eus. l. c.

timonies: but I am contented with quoting merely those parts, which contain actual fragments of the writers themselves: and unless we suppose Basil to have been the most imprudent as well as the most deceitful of men, he would never have made this appeal to antiquity, when he was defending himself for ascribing the same glory to the Son and the Holy Ghost, as to the Father.

It is true, that Eusebius appears to have found a different reading in his copy of Polycarp's prayer: and a critical question like this can never be demonstrably settled. It is however worthy of remark, that in the letter of the church of Smyrna, alluded to above, we find the following expression at the close of it: "We wish you health, brethren, while "you walk according to the gospel of Jesus Christ, "with whom be glory to God the Father and the "Holy Ghost^f." The words are almost literally the same as those used by Polycarp, and in their meaning are precisely equivalent: so that if they do not lead us to conclude, that Usher's edition gives the true reading, they at least supply us with another passage of the same date, in which the Son is made a partaker in glory with the Father and the Holy Ghost. A similar passage occurs in that very ancient and interesting document, *the Martyrdom of Ignatius*, concerning the genuineness of which little or no doubt is entertained. It ends with these words, "—— in Christ Jesus our Lord, "through whom and with whom be glory and

^f Ερρέσθαι ὑμᾶς εὐχόμεθα, ἀδελ-
φοί, στοιχοῦντας τῷ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγ-
γέλιον λόγῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ
δόξα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ ἄγιῷ Πνεύματι. This concluding part
of the Epistle, which is not quoted by Eusebius, is added
by Valesius in his notes, p. 171.

“ power to the Father with the Holy Ghost for “ ever^{g.}” Here we find both the forms, *through whom and with whom*: and so in fact do we read in the prayer of Polycarp as given by Eusebius, where the words δι' οὐ σὺν αὐτῷ are equivalent to δι' οὐ καὶ μεθ' οὐ, and thus even Eusebius makes Polycarp ascribe glory to the Father *together with the Son*. For the preposition *with* being equivalent to the conjunction *and* in these doxologies, I would refer to Basil. l. c. c. 25.

The question now remains, whether doxologies such as these do not prove, that the doctrine of the Trinity was held by those who used them; whether such persons did not believe, that the Son and the Holy Ghost, who were equal in glory with the Father, were also of the same nature and substance. It might seem trifling to enquire, whether created beings could ever be put upon an equality in glory and power with God: and we may say with Athanasius, when he is speaking of the form used in baptism, “ What communion is there between the “ creature and the Creator? why is the thing made “ numbered with Him who made it^h? ” or with Basil, “ We say that beings of the same dignity are “ to be coupled together; but where there are de- “ grees of inferiority, one must be enumerated after “ the otherⁱ. ” We may here refer to the Arians themselves as allowing, that doxologies, such as that used by Polycarp, were not agreeable to their own

^g Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ π. 508.
ἡμῶν, δι' οὐ καὶ μεθ' οὐ τῷ Πατρὶ ἡ δύξα καὶ τὸ κράτος σὺν τῷ Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς αἰῶνας. Apud Cotel. vol. II. p. 162.

ⁱ Ἡμεῖς τοῖς μὲν ὁμοτίμοις φαμὲν τὴν συναρθμησιν πρέπειν τοῖς δὲ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον παρηλλαγέντοις τὴν ὑπαρθμησιν. De Sp. San. c. 17.

^h Orat. cont. Arian. II. 41.

theories concerning the nature of Christ: for why then did they prefer the other form, which glorified God, not *with Christ*, but *through Christ*^k? It is however demonstrable, that the form *with Christ* was used as early as the second century: and I therefore conclude, that the doctrine of the Trinity, which considers the three persons in the Godhead to be co-equal, was held in the second century by Polycarp, who was the immediate disciple of St. John^l.

JUSTINUS MARTYR. A.D. 150.

4. *Justin. Apol.* I. 6. p. 47.

In the present instance I must depart from my usual plan of giving a translation of the passage, and adding the original in a note: for the Greek words have been cited with such opposite views, and translated in so many different ways, that it is absolutely necessary to lay them in the first instance before the reader. Justin is answering the charge of atheism, which was brought against the Christians, and observes, that they were punished for not worshipping evil demons, which were not really gods. Ἐνθένδε καὶ ἄθεοι κελήμεθα. Καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας Θεοῦ. Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Τίὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, [καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἔξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν,] πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες, καὶ παντὶ βουλομένῳ μαθεῖν, ὃς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀφθίνως παραδίδοντες.

^k See Basil. de Spiritu Sanct. c. 6. to Suicer's Thesaurus, v. Δοξολογία, and to bishop Bull's Def.

^l The reader may be referred Fid. Nic. II. 3, 6, &c.

With the exception of the words, which I have included in brackets, there can be no difficulty in translating this passage. “ Hence it is that we are “ called atheists: and we confess that we are atheists “ with respect to such reputed gods as these: but “ not with respect to the true God, the Father of “ justice, temperance, and every other virtue, with “ whom is no mixture of evil. But Him, and the “ Son who came from Him and gave us this in- “ struction, and the prophetic Spirit, we worship “ and adore, paying them a reasonable and true “ honour, and not refusing to deliver to any one “ else, who wishes to be taught, what we ourselves “ have learnt.”

With respect to the words included in brackets, Roman catholic writers have quoted them as supporting the worship of angels: and if we connect $\tauὸν στρατὸν$ immediately with $σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν$, Justin certainly appears to say, “ We reverence and “ worship the Father, and the Son, and the host of “ the other good angels which attend upon and re- “ semble them.” Bellarmin refers to the passage with this view^m: and Prudentius Maranus, the Be- nectine editor of Justin Martyr, argues at some length in his prefaceⁿ, that the words cannot re- ceive any other interpretation. Scultetus, a pro- testant divine of Heidelberg, in his *Medulla Theo- logiae Patrum*^o, which appeared in 1605, gave a totally different meaning to the passage, and instead of connecting $\tauὸν στρατὸν$ with $σεβόμεθα$, connected it with $διδάξαντα$. The words would then be rendered thus: “ But Him, and the Son who came from

^m De Beatitudine Sanctorum, I. 13.

ⁿ Part II. c. IV. p. xxi. ^o Cap. 18. p. 40.

“ Him, who also gave us instructions concerning “ these things, and concerning the host of the other “ good angels, we worship &c.” This interpretation is adopted and defended at some length by bishop Bull^p, and by Stephen Le Moyne^q; and even the Benedictine Le Nourry^r supposed Justin to mean, that Christ had taught us not to worship the bad angels, as well as the existence of good angels. Grabe, in his edition of Justin’s *Apology*, which was printed in 1703, adopted another interpretation, which had been before proposed by Le Moyne and by Cave^s. This also connects τὸν στρατὸν with διδάξαντα, and would require us to render the passage thus: “—— and the Son who came from Him, “ who also taught these things to us and to the host “ of the other angels &c.” It might be thought, that Langus, who published a Latin translation of Justin in 1565, meant to adopt one of these interpretations, or at least to connect τὸν στρατὸν with διδάξαντα. Both of them certainly are ingenious, and are not perhaps opposed to the literal construction of the Greek words: but I cannot say that they are satisfactory; or that I am surprised at Roman catholic writers describing them as forced and violent attempts to evade a difficulty. If the words enclosed in brackets were removed, the whole passage would certainly contain a strong argument in favour of the Trinity: but as they now stand, Roman catholic writers will naturally quote them as supporting the worship of angels. There is however this difficulty in such a construction of the

^p Def. Fid. Nic. II. 4. 8. A-nimadv. in G. Clerke, §. 21.

^q Var. Sacr. vol. II. p. 185.

^r Diss. II. §. xvi. p. 414.

^s Primitive Christianity, p. 13.

passage: it proves too much: by coupling the angels with the three persons of the Trinity, as objects of religious adoration, it seems to go beyond even what Roman catholics themselves would maintain concerning the worship of angels. Their well-known distinction between *λατρεία* and *δουλεία* would be entirely confounded: and the difficulty felt by the Benedictine editor appears to have been as great, as his attempt to explain it is unsuccessful, when he wrote as follows: “Our adversaries in vain object “the twofold expression, *σέβομεν καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν*, we “worship and adore. For the former is applied to “angels themselves, regard being had to the dis-“tinction between the creature and the Creator: “the latter by no means necessarily includes the “angels.” This sentence requires concessions, which no opponent could be expected to make: and if one of the two terms, *σέβομεν καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν*, may be applied to angels, it is unreasonable to contend that the other must not also. Perhaps however the passage may be explained so as to admit a distinction of this kind. The interpretations of Scultetus and Grabe have not found many advocates: and upon the whole I should be inclined to conclude, that the clause, which relates to the angels, is connected particularly with the words *λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες*.

A transposition was proposed by Dr. Ashton, who published an edition of the two Apologies in 1768, which would make this construction still more apparent, and would in fact remove every difficulty. He proposes to place the words, which I have included in brackets, after *τιμῶντες*. The passage would then be as follows: “But Him, and the Son who “came from Him and gave us this instruction, and

“ the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore rationally and truly, honouring also the host of the other angels &c.” This transposition has been adopted by Mr. Lowe, in his Letter to Dr. Milner, and in an article published in the British Critic, for January 1830, p. 165. It would certainly deprive the Roman catholics of the use which they make of this passage, and would at once point out the distinction between the adoration paid to God, and the honour given to created and ministering spirits. If we were to adopt the transposition at all, I should perhaps place the words after *προσκυνοῦμεν*, and so connect λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ with the honour paid to the angels. Justin might be supposed to use the words *rationally and truly* with reference to the irrational and false worship which he had lately been exposing, as paid by the heathen to evil demons. But upon the whole I cannot bring myself to do such violence to the text upon mere conjecture, and in the face of every manuscript. The transposition would be convenient, and perhaps decisive: but in such cases it is the part of criticism as well as of candour to say,

Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget :

and I would rather give up the passage to the Roman catholics, and call upon them to rescue Justin from the charge of confounding the creature with the Creator: or (which is perhaps the safe and true course) we may fairly extract from the passage the same meaning which is given to it by Dr. Ashton, without having recourse to his unauthorized transposition.

Justin, as I observed, is defending the Christians

from the charge of atheism: and after saying that the gods, whom they refused to worship, were no gods, but evil demons, he points out what were the Beings, who were worshipped by the Christians. He names the true God, who is the source of all virtue; the Son, who proceeded from him; the good and ministering spirits; and the Holy Ghost. To these Beings, he says, we pay all the worship, adoration, and honour, which is due to each of them: i. e. worship, where worship is due, and honour, where honour is due. The Christians were accused of worshipping no gods, that is, of acknowledging no superior beings at all. Justin shews, that so far was this from being true, that they acknowledged more than one order of spiritual Beings: they offered divine worship to the true God, and they also believed in the existence of good spirits, which were entitled to honour and respect. If the reader will view the passage as a whole, he will perhaps see that there is nothing violent in thus restricting the words *σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν*, and *τιμῶντες*, to certain parts of it respectively. It may seem strange, that Justin should mention the ministering spirits before the Holy Ghost: but this is a difficulty, which presses upon the Roman catholics as much as upon ourselves: and we may perhaps adopt the explanation of the bishop of Lincoln, who says, “I have sometimes thought that in this passage *καὶ τὸν—στρατὸν* is equivalent to *μετὰ τοῦ—στρατοῦ*, and that Justin had in his mind the glorified state of Christ, when he should come to judge the world, surrounded by the host of heaven.”

^t Some account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr, p. 53. A similar remark is made by Basil concerning

The bishop then brings several passages from Justin, where the Son of God is spoken of, as attended by a company of angels: and if this idea was then in Justin's mind, it might account for his naming the ministering spirits immediately after the Son of God, rather than after the Holy Ghost, which would have been the natural and proper order.

That this was the meaning of Justin, and that he did not intend to include the angels in that divine worship, which is paid to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may appear from a similar passage in the same Apology, where no mention is made of angels. "That we are not atheists, who would not "acknowledge, when we worship the Creator of "this universe, and Jesus Christ, who was our in- "structor in these things, knowing him to be the "Son of this true God, and assigning to him the "second place? And I shall prove presently, that "we honour the prophetic Spirit in the third rank, "and that we are reasonable in so doing." If this passage should appear at first sight to represent an inequality between the three persons of the Trinity, and particularly with respect to the third person, it may at least prove, that in the former passage the writer did not mean to assign a *fourth* place to the Holy Ghost, and after the ministering spirits: for he here distinctly says, that the prophetic Spirit has the *third* place: and there is no reason to suppose, that Justin meant to say any thing more, than what

ing St. Paul's mention of angels λογίσει; τὸν διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων
in 1 Tim. v. 21. *De Spir. S.* γενίμενον ἡμῖν, — Τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ
c. 12. ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ

"Αθεοί μὲν ἀνὴρ ὡς οὐκ ἐσμὲν, τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σε-
βόμενοι, — τις σωφρόνων οὐχ ὁμο- χώρῳ ἔχοντες· Πινεῦμά τε προφητικὸν
ἔν τρίτῃ τάξει ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τιμῶ-
μεν, ἀποδείξομεν. c. 13. p. 50, 51.

is and must be said by the soundest Trinitarian, that the Father is the first person, the Son is the second person, and the Holy Ghost is the third person in a co-equal and co-eternal Trinity.

Further light may be thrown upon the sentiments of Justin, and upon the construction of the controverted passage, if we compare it with another in the Legation of Athenagoras, where the same train of reasoning is pursued, but where a marked difference is preserved between the three persons of the Trinity and the angels. “Who would not be astonished to hear us called atheists, when we speak of “the Father as God, and the Son as God, and the “Holy Ghost, shewing at the same time their power “in unity, and their distinction in order? Nor does “the system of our theology stop here: but we say “that there is a multitude of angels and ministers, “whom God the Maker and Creator of the world “distributed by the Word proceeding from himself, “and appointed them their stations at the elements “and the heavens, the world and every thing there-“in, and the harmony of them^x.” There are some passages in Origen which agree still more remarkably with the words of Justin, and shew plainly what were the sentiments of the fathers concerning the honour due to angels. In his work against Celsus, he says, “Because together with God we “worship his Son, Celsus thinks that it follows upon

^x Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἀν ἀπορήσαι, λέγον-
τας Θεὸν Πατέρα καὶ Τὸν Θεὸν καὶ
Πνεῦμα ἄγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ
τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν
τῇ τάξει διαιρεσιν, ἀκόντιας ἀθέους
καλουμένους; καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ
θεολογικὸν ἡμῶν ἴσταται μέρος ἀλλὰ
καὶ πλῆθος ἀγγέλων καὶ λειτουργῶν
φαμὲν, οὓς ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ δημιουργὸς
κόσμου Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτῷ λόγου
διένειμε, καὶ διέταξε περὶ τε τὰ στοι-
χεῖα είναι καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὸν
κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὴν τού-
των εὐταξίαν. c. 10. p. 287. See
also the passage quoted from
Athenagoras, c. 24. in No. 8.

“ our principles, that not only God, but his ministers also are worshipped (*θεραπεύεσθαι*). If he had meant those beings who are truly ministers of God after his only begotten Son, such as Gabriel, and Michael, and the other angels and archangels, and had said that these ought to be worshipped ; perhaps after having purified (*έκκαθήρωτες*) the meaning of the term *worship*, (*θεραπεύειν*) and the actions of the worshipper, I might have explained what conceptions we are able to form concerning them.” He afterwards says, “ If we see certain beings appointed to these offices, not demons, but angels, we address them as blessed and happy, (*εὐφημοῦμεν καὶ μακαρίζομεν*), but we do not pay to them the honour (*τιμὴν*) which is paid to God^z :” which agrees with what he had said at the beginning of this work, that we are to believe in “ the supreme God, and in him who taught us to worship (*σέβειν*) him only, and to pass by all other objects, either as having no real existence, or, if they exist, as being worthy of honour, but not of adoration and worship, (*προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβασμοῦ^a*).” All these passages taken together may lead us to conclude, that Justin Martyr considered the Son and the Holy Ghost as objects of religious worship. He makes no distinction between the adoration paid to them and to the Father : and when called upon to prove that the Christians were not atheists, he proves that they worshipped God, because they worshipped the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

y VIII. 13. p. 751.

^z Ib. 57. p. 785.

^a I. 11. p. 329. See also Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* IV. 10. p. 148. VII. 15. p. 327. *Dem.*

Evang. III. p. 106, 107. in all of which places the distinction is observed between *τιμῆν* and *σέβειν*.

5. *Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. 56. p. 152.*

The next quotation requires us to bear in mind what I mentioned in my former work, (No. 23.) that whenever God is said in the Old Testament to have revealed himself, or to have been seen by any person, it was not the Father, but the Son. Justin, as I then stated, is very diffuse in establishing this position : and many of the passages which are thus explained compel us to conclude, that he applied the term *God* to the *Son* in the fullest and highest signification. He now shews that he did not understand this manifestation of the Father by the Son in a Sabellian sense : and though theology had not yet employed any Greek term equivalent to *person*, he sufficiently expresses the distinct personality of the Father and the Son.

“ Returning to the Scriptures, I will endeavour “ to persuade you, that this God, who is said in the “ Scriptures to have been seen by Abraham and “ Jacob and Moses, is a different Being from the “ God who created the universe ; I mean different “ in number, (or numerically,) but not in counsel : “ for I affirm, that he never did any thing, except “ what the Creator himself, above whom there is “ no other God, wished him to do or to say ^b. ”

The word *person*, as I have observed, not having yet come into use in this sense, Justin could hardly have employed any other which would more plainly convey an idea of distinct individuality than ἀριθμῷ,

^b Επὶ τὰς γραφὰς ἐπανελθόν, πειράσομαι πεῖσαι ὑμᾶς, διὰ ὃτος δὲ τε τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ Ἰακὼβ καὶ τῷ Μωϋ̄ε ὥφει λεγόμενος καὶ γεγραμμένος Θεὸς ἔτερός ἐστι τοῦ τὰ πάντα ποιῆσαντος Θεοῦ, ἀριθμῷ λέγω,

ἀλλ' οὐ γνώμην οὐδὲν γάρ φημι αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι ποτε, ἢ ἀπερ αὐτὸς δὲ τὸν κόσμον ποιήσας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι Θεός, βεβαύληται καὶ πρᾶξαι καὶ ὅμιλησαι.

numerically. The following passages will also shew that something like Sabellianism had already been maintained, but that Justin was decidedly opposed to it. “ The Jews, who think that it was always “ the Father of the universe who talked with Moses, “ whereas the person who spoke to him was the Son “ of God, who is also called an angel and apostle, “ are justly convicted of knowing neither the Fa- “ ther nor the Son : for they who say that the Son “ is the Father, are convicted of neither understand- “ ing the Father, nor of knowing that the Father of “ the universe has a Son, who also being the first- “ born Logos of God, is likewise God^c. ” He speaks still more plainly in the following passage : “ I am “ aware that there are some who wish to meet this “ by saying, that the power which appeared from “ the Father of the universe to Moses, or Abraham, “ or Jacob, is called *an angel* in his coming among “ men, since by this the will of the Father is made “ known to men : he is also called *Glory*, since he “ is sometimes seen in an unsubstantial appearance: “ sometimes he is called *a man*, since he appears “ under such forms as the Father pleases : and they “ call him *the Word*, since he is also the bearer of “ messages from the Father to men. But they say, “ that this power is unseparated and undivided from “ the Father, in the same manner that the light of “ the sun when on earth is unseparated and un- “ divided from the sun in heaven; and when it sets, “ the light is removed with it : so the Father, they “ say, when he wishes, makes his power go forth ; “ and when he wishes, he brings it back again to “ himself. In this same manner, according to their

^c Apol. I. 63. p. 81.

“ doctrine, he also made the angels^d.” This is little else than Sabellianism: and Justin shews his own opinion of such an irrational hypothesis when he goes on to say, “ But that there are angels, and that “ they continue always to exist, and are not resolved “ into that out of which they were produced, has “ been proved above: and I have also proved at “ some length, that this power, which the pro- “ phetical language speaks of as God, and as an “ angel, has not a mere nominal enumeration like “ the light of the sun, but also in number [i. e. in “ numerical individuality] is something different.”

We have here the same term, ἀριθμός, used, as I have explained it, for *numerical individuality*: and though the sun, and the light proceeding from the sun, are not in fact one and the same, yet Justin says, that the Father and the Son are still more numerically distinct: which demonstrably proves that he was entirely opposed to the Sabellian hypothesis: and his conclusion of this part of the argument is, that “ that which is begotten is numerically dif-“ ferent from that which begets it^e. ” He nevertheless made use of the analogy of the sun and its effulgence to illustrate the manner in which the Son proceeded from the Father: and the persons who anticipated Sabellius replied to his argument by saying, that the substance of the Father was thus divided into two. To which Justin answers, “ I “ have explained in a few words before, that this

^d Dial. cum Tryph. 128. p. ὸνδιατι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ 221.

^e Καὶ δὲ δύναμις αὕτη, ἣν καὶ θεὸν καλεῖ ὁ προφητικὸς Λόγος, διὰ πολλῶν ὀσπαύτως ἀποδέδεικται, καὶ ^f Τὸ γεννάμενον τοῦ γεννῶντος ἀριθ-
ῆγγελον, οὐχ ὡς τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς μᾶς ἔτερόν ἐστι.

“ Power was begotten by the Father, by his power
 “ and will, and not by being severed from him, as
 “ if the substance of the Father was divided in the
 “ same manner as all other things which are divided
 “ and severed are not the same as they were before
 “ they were severed : and I used as an example the
 “ fires lighted from another fire, which we see to be
 “ different, though that from which many may be
 “ lighted is not diminished, but continues the same^g.”

The passage to which he alludes was probably this,
 “ As in the case of fire, we see another fire produced,
 “ though that from which it is lighted is not dimin-
 “ ished, but continues the same ; and that which is
 “ lighted from it appears to have its own existence,
 “ without diminishing that from which it was
 “ lighted^h.” Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr,
 made use of the same illustration to express the ge-
 neration of the Sonⁱ: but I shall not dwell longer
 upon this part of the subject, which has been so
 profoundly investigated by bishop Bull^k; and I have
 only noticed these expressions in the writings of the
 fathers, as shewing that they believed the Son to be
 of the same nature or substance with the Father,
 and yet to be personally distinct from him.

g ——εἰπὼν τὴν δύναμιν ταῦτην
 γεγενῆθαις ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς δυνάμεις
 καὶ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ οὐ κατ’ ἀπο-
 τομὴν, ὡς ἀπομερίζομένης τῆς τοῦ Πα-
 τρὸς οὐσίας, ὅποια τὰ ἄλλα πάντα
 μεριζόμενα καὶ τεμόμενα, οὐ τὰ
 αὐτά ἔστιν ἂ καὶ πρὸ τημοθῆναι· καὶ
 παραδίγματος χάριν παρειλήφειν τὰ
 ὃς ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἀνακτόμενα πυρὰ ἔτερα
 ὄρῶμεν, οὐδὲν ἐλαττονέουν ἔκεινον ἐξ
 οὐ ἀναφθῆναι πολλὰ δύνανται, ἀλλὰ

ταῦτον μένοντος. Pag. 221, 222.

h Καὶ ὅποιον ἐπὶ πυρὸς ὄρῶμεν
 ἄλλο γινόμενον, οὐκ ἐλαττονέουν
 ἔκεινον ἐξ ὅς ἡ ἀναψις γέγονε, ἀλλὰ
 τοῦ αὐτοῦ μένοντος, καὶ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ
 ἀναφθὲν καὶ αὐτὸν φαίνεται, οὐκ
 ἐλαττόσαν ἔκεινον ἐξ οὗ ἀνήφθη.
 Dial. cum Tryph. 61. p. 158.

i Orat. c. Græcos, 5. p.
 247, 248.

k Def. Fid. Nic. II. 4.

ATHENAGORAS, A. D. 170.

6. *Athenag. Legat. pro Christianis*, c. 10. p. 286-7.

The following passage, which was written towards the end of the second century, may surprise those persons who have allowed themselves to believe that the mystery of the Trinity is a recent invention. Athenagoras is explaining the belief of the Christians in the Father and the Son, and after stating the latter to be the Logos of the Father, which Logos is either in the mind, or displayed in the action, he adds, “ For all things were made by “ him and through him, the Father and the Son “ being one: and since the Son is in the Father, “ and the Father in the Son, by the unity and “ power of the Spirit, the Son of God is the Mind “ and Word of God! ” This passage is followed shortly after by that which I have quoted at p. 22. where Athenagoras says, “ We speak of the Father “ as God, and the Son as God, and the Holy Ghost, “ shewing at the same time their power in unity, “ and their distinction in order.”

7. *Athenag. Legat. pro Christianis*, c. 12. p. 289.

The following passage is still more remarkable, in which Athenagoras, after contrasting the expectations of a future life, which the heathen could have, with the sure and certain hope of a Christian, observes, “ But we who look upon this present life as “ worth little or nothing, and are conducted through “ it by the sole principle of knowing God and the “ Word proceeding from him, of knowing what is

¹ Πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἤγεντο, ἐνος ὅντος τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Τίου· ὅντος δὲ τοῦ Τίου ἐπατρὶ, καὶ Πατρὸς ἐν Τίῳ, ἐνότητι καὶ δυνάμει Πνεύματος, νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ Τίος τοῦ Θεοῦ. For the explanations of this passage I would refer to Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* II. 4, 9. and Waterland, vol. III. p. 72.

“ the unity of the Son with the Father, what is the communion of the Father with the Son, [or, what the Father communicates to the Son,] what is the Spirit, what is the union of this number of persons, the Spirit, the Son, the Father, and in what way they who are united are divided——shall we not have credit given us for being worshippers of God^m? ”

8. *Athenag. Legat. pro Christianis*, c. 24. p. 302.

The following passage is obscure, and requires the reader to be acquainted with the peculiar language of the fathers: but the general meaning of it cannot be mistaken. “ We speak of God, and the Son his Word, and the Holy Ghost, which are united in their essence, the Father, the Son, the Spirit, because the Son is the Mind, Reason, or Wisdom of the Father ; and the Spirit is an emanation, as light from fireⁿ. ” If it be said, that the personality of the second and third persons in the Trinity could hardly have been believed by Athenagoras, when he speaks of the Son as the Mind of God, and of the Holy Ghost as an emanation, *ἀπόρροια*, it may

^m Ἀνθρωποι δὲ, τὸν μὲν ἐνταῦθα δλίγου καὶ μικροῦ τινος ἄξιον βίον λελογισμένοι, ὑπὸ μόνου δὲ παραπεμπόμενοι τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Λόγον εἰδέναι, τις ἡ τοῦ παιῶν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἐνότης, τις ἡ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν Τίον κοινωνία, τί τὸ πνεῦμα, τις ἡ τῶν τοσούτων ἔνωσις, καὶ διαιρέσις ἐνουμένων, τοῦ Πνεύματος, τοῦ παιδὸς, τοῦ Πατρὸς, —ἀποτύμενθα θεοσεβεῖν ; I have adopted the Benedictine editor’s emendation of τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν for τούτου ὃν ἕστως Θεόν.

ⁿ Θεὸν φαμὲν, καὶ Τίον, τὸν Λόγον αὐτοῦ, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἀγιον, ἐνούμενα

μὲν κατὰ δύναμιν, τὸν Πατέρα, τὸν Τίον, τὸ Πνεῦμα, δτι νοῦς, Λόγος, σοφία Τίος τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἀπόρροια, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, τὸ Πνεῦμα. The Benedictine editor explains δύναμις in this passage to mean οὐσία, and so I have translated it. ‘Ἐνούμενα μὲν κατὰ δύναμιν may remind us of τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνόσει δύναμιν, as quoted from this same writer at p. 22. and there seem to be some words wanting here, such as διαιρούμενα δὲ κατὰ τάξιν but I suspect a longer lacuna.

be answered, that these expressions were used by the fathers merely as illustrations. It seems probable that they borrowed the illustration from the Platonizing Jews of Alexandria, who had learned almost to personify the mind or reason of God, as may be seen in the works of Philo Judæus; and had taken to speak of wisdom, as *the breath of the power of God, and a pure influence flowing from (ἀνέποια) the glory of the Almighty.* (Wisd. vii. 25.) It may be demonstrated, that these Alexandrian Jews did not really mean to speak of Wisdom, or the Reason of God, as distinctly existing persons^o: but the Christian fathers found their expressions so very applicable to an idea of personality, that they borrowed them, when speaking of the Son and the Holy Ghost: though they guard against the notion of these expressions being applied too literally, and say repeatedly, that the Father and the Son are *numerically*, i. e. personally, different. Still, however, the Mind or Reason of God, which is not the same as God, though inseparably united with him, furnished some analogy for the unity and the distinction of the Father and the Son: and the Holy Ghost was spoken of as an efflux or emanation, because such an expression conveys some idea of a being proceeding from God, while it excludes the notion of creation. Expressions such as these, if they stood alone in the writings of the fathers, though they demonstrate that the Son and the Holy Ghost could not have been looked upon as created beings, might yet seem to present an agreement with the Sabellian hypothesis: but other expressions, as

^o I may refer the reader for a consideration of this subject to the seventh of my Bampton Lectures.

I have already shewn, are directly opposed to this notion: and hence we conclude by comparing the fathers with themselves, and with each other, that they neither divided the substance, nor confounded the persons, in the Godhead.

I ought, perhaps, in this place to introduce the testimony of a heathen writer, who was a contemporary of Athenagoras: and the passage which has often been adduced from the *Philopatris* of Lucian, must certainly be considered as confirming in a remarkable manner the belief of a Trinity in Unity. The speakers in this dialogue are Critias and Triephon; the former an heathen, the latter a Christian; and when Critias has offered to swear by different heathen deities, each of which is objected to by Triephon, he asks, “By whom then shall I swear?” to which Triephon makes the following reply, the first words of which are a quotation from Homer,

“ By the great God, immortal, in the heavens;
“ The Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from
“ the Father, one out of three, and three out of one,
“ Consider these thy Jove, be this thy God.”

Critias then ridicules this “arithmetical oath,” and says, “I cannot tell what you mean by saying that “one is three, and three are one.”

There can be no doubt, that when this dialogue was written, it was commonly known to the heathen, that the Christians believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, though in one sense three, in another sense to be one: and if the dialogue was writ-

P Trieph. “Τυμεδόντα θέον, μέγαν, ἀμβροτον, οὐρανίνα, Τίον Πατρὸς, Πινεύμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, ἐν τριῶν, καὶ εἴς ἐνὸς τρία,

Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζῆρα, τόνδι ἥροι Θεόν. Crit.—οὐκ ὅδα γὰρ τί λέγεις, ἐν τριά, τρία ἐν. c. 12. p. 596.

ten by Lucian, who lived in the latter part of the second century, it would be one of the strongest testimonies remaining to the doctrine of the Trinity. This was acknowledged by Socinus, who says in one of his works, “that he had never read any “thing which gave greater proof of a worship of “the Trinity being then received among Christians, than the passage which is brought from the “dialogue entitled Philopatris, and which is reckoned among the works of Lucian^{q.}” He then observes, that the dialogue is generally supposed by the learned to be falsely ascribed to Lucian; and he adds some arguments which might make the passage of less weight, in proving that all Christians of that day believed a Trinity in Unity. I have no inclination to notice these arguments: but Socinus was correct in saying, that the learned had generally decided against the genuineness of this dialogue as a work of Lucian. Bishop Bull^r believed it to be genuine, and Fabricius^s was inclined to do the same. Some have ascribed it to a writer older than the time of Lucian; others, to one of the same age; and others, to much later periods. I need only refer the reader to discussions of the subject by Dodwell^t, Blondell^u, Lardner^x, &c.: but J. M. Gesner has considered the question in a long and able Disserta-

^q Nec vero nobis quidquam hactenus legere contigit, quod trini istius Dei a Christianis jam tum recepti et culti fidem facere videatur magis, quam quæ ex dialogo, qui Philopatris inscribitur, et inter Luciani opera numeratur, ad id probandum affert Genebrardus, lib. I. et II. de Trinitate. *Defens. Animadv. adversus Gab. Eutropium*, c. 15.

p. 698.

^r Def. Fid. Nic. II. 4, 11.
Jud. Eccl. Cath. IV. 4.

^s Bibl. Gr. vol. III. p. 504.
Lux. Evang. p. 153.

^t De Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, p. 284.

^u De Episcopis et Presbyteris, p. 228.

^x Credibility, Art. *Lucian.*
vol. VII. p. 285, &c.

tion^y, the object of which is to prove that the *Philopatris* was written in the reign of Julian the apostate. His arguments appear to me to deserve much attention ; and though the learned do not seem in general to have adopted his conclusion, I feel so far convinced by them, that I cannot bring forward this remarkable passage, as the testimony of a writer of the second century.

THEOPHILUS, A. D. 180.

In my former work I gave no account of this father, (though his writings were incidentally quoted,) because the passages, which I wish to adduce, not only support the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but of the Trinity, and may therefore be more suitably introduced in this place.

Some doubts have been raised concerning the identity and the date of Theophilus : but it seems to be generally agreed, that the person whose works have come down to us was the sixth bishop of Antioch, and was appointed to that see about the year 168. He tells us himself, that he had been bred up in heathenism, and it is plain that his language and thoughts retained a lasting impression from the Platonic philosophy. None of his genuine works have come down to us, except three books addressed to Autolycus, who was a friend of Theophilus, and a man of profound learning, but strongly opposed to Christianity. Theophilus is supposed to have written this work at the beginning of the reign of Commodus, and to have died soon after, about the year 181.

^y Published in Vol. III. of the edition of Lucian by Reitzius, 1743.

9. *Theophili ad Autolycum lib. II. c. 15. p. 360.*

I quote this passage, not on account of the sentiment which it contains, (for the allusion is sufficiently puerile,) but because it is the earliest passage in the works of any of the fathers, where we find the Greek word Τριάς, *Trinity*^z: and we can thus prove, that the term was applied to the three persons of the Trinity as early as toward the end of the second century.

Theophilus had been giving an account of the creation, as described by Moses in the book of Genesis; and following that allegorical method of interpretation, which the fathers borrowed too freely from the schools of Alexandria, he extracts a hidden meaning from the fact of the heavenly bodies being created on the fourth day. “In like manner also “the three days, which preceded the luminaries, are “types of the Trinity, of God and his Word and “his Wisdom^a. ” It is not necessary to attempt to explain this typical allusion; and the reader is perhaps aware, that the term *Wisdom* was applied by the fathers to the second and third persons of the Trinity, though more frequently to the second. As bishop Bull observes, “Veteres secundæ et tertiae “personæ, ob communem utriusque tum naturam, tum “ab eadem τηγῇ Θεότητος derivationem, etiam nomina “fecisse communia^b. ” It is plain, that in the present instance the term *Wisdom* is applied to the

^z This passage is overlooked by Suicer in his Thesaurus, v. Τριάς, who very properly observes, that the *Expositio rectæ confessionis*, in which the word occurs, and which has been ascribed to Justin Martyr, is later than that writer by some cen-

turies.

^a Οσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι [πρὸ] τῶν φωστήρων γεγονῖαι τίποι εἰσὶ τῆς Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.

^b Def. Fid. Nic. II. 4, 10. See also Grotius in Marc. ii. 8.

Holy Ghost, as bishop Bull has shewn it to have been by Irenæus, Origen, and others^c: and if this indiscriminate application of names should lead any persons to imagine, that the fathers confounded the personality of the Son and the Holy Ghost, we may adduce the present passage as a proof to the contrary, in which the word Τριάς, and the allusion to three distinct days, require us to interpret *the Word of God*, and *the Wisdom of God*, of two distinct persons.

It is hardly necessary to add, that in adducing this passage as the earliest instance of the use of the word Τριάς, I confine the remark to the ecclesiastical meaning of the term, and to its application to the three persons of the Godhead. It would appear from Aulus Gellius^d, who probably wrote a few years before Theophilus, that τριάς in Greek, as *ternio* in Latin, signified *the number three*: and if we speak of the cube, or square, or any other power of *three*, we should not say τριῶν, but τῆς τριάδος. The word is also frequently used by Philo Judæus in his work upon the creation^e, where he speculates upon the number of days in a manner very similar to that followed by Theophilus. The passage in A. Gellius might lead us to think, that Pythagoras had made use of the term τριάς: and his peculiar theory concerning numbers led him to pay particular regard to the number three. The word also occurs in one of those spurious oracles, which have been ascribed to Zoroaster and the Persian magi;

Παντὶ γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει τριάς, ἡς μονὰς ἀρχή.
and from this and similar expressions it has been

^c Def. Fid. Nic. II. 5, 7. IV.
3, 11.

^d I. 20.
^e De Opificio, p. 10.

thought by some persons, that the Chaldees and Persians had a notion of a Trinity in unity^f. I cannot, however, persuade myself, that there is any real foundation for this opinion. It is true, that the later Platonists found out several allusions to a Trinity in the writings of Plato; and many of the fathers extracted a similar meaning from these passages. The former wished to prove, that the Christians had borrowed from Plato: and the latter inadvertently thought to support the doctrines of the Gospel, by finding a resemblance to them in the writings of Plato. This is, I believe, a correct account of the system which prevailed in the early ages of Christianity, of interpreting Plato in a Christian sense: and the same spirit, which led to the distortion and misrepresentation of the Athenian philosopher, was most probably the cause of the forgery of many of those oracles, which were ascribed to the Sibyls and the Magi. It is demonstrable, that some of these oracles were in existence in the time of Justin Martyr: and his manner of quoting them proves not only their existence, but that they must have been written a certain time before, so as to have obtained a general circulation and belief in those days. The forgeries of this kind may perhaps be traced to Alexandria as their birth-place: and the same injudicious feeling, which I have supposed to have weighed with the Christian fathers, may have induced the Alexandrian Jews to appeal to certain ancient records of Greece and Persia as agreeing with Moses. The heathen philoso-

^f See Cudworth, *Systema Intellectuale*, and Mosheim's notes, IV. 17. p. 436. I may also refer to my Bampton Lectures, note 90. p. 546.

phers made the same appeal, with a view to deprecate the antiquity and originality of the books of Moses: and thus the spurious works of Orpheus, Zoroaster, the Sibyls, &c. were received and quoted by both parties. Many of these oracles or fragments of ancient poetry bear undoubted marks of being written by Jews, or by persons acquainted with the Jewish scriptures: and these may be traced to Alexandria. Others again speak plainly and explicitly of Christ and the gospel: and these may be ascribed to the later Platonists, or their injudicious Christian opponents. The passage quoted above, in which the word *τριὰς* occurs, is taken from the writings of Damascius, who lived in the sixth century: and it may therefore have been a late forgery, when the controversy concerning the Trinity attracted the notice of the heathen philosophers.

We perhaps ought not to infer from the words of Theophilus, that the term *τριὰς* had come in his day to bear the signification of a trinity in unity. He may have used it merely to express *three things*; and the *three days*, which he compares with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, might have been spoken of by him as *τριὰς τῶν ἡμερῶν*, *a triad*, or *trinity of days*. In this sense Clement of Alexandria speaks of “the holy triad or trinity, faith, hope, and “charity^g;” and Origen uses the terms *τριὰς* and *τετρὰς* for periods of three and four years respectively^h: Tertullian also at the end of the second century used the term *trinitas* in the same ordinary sense, for any three thingsⁱ: but the passage, which

^g Ἡ ἀγία τριὰς, πίστις, ἐλπίς, 129.
ἀγάπη. Strom. IV. 7. p. 588. ⁱ Adv. Valent. 17. p. 258.

^h In Joan. tom. VI. 14. p. De Anima, 16. p. 274.

I shall quote at length in N°. 30, seems to shew, that in his day the term was applied in a particular manner to the three persons of the Godhead. I would not therefore argue from the mere occurrence of the word in the writings of Theophilus, that *τριάς* contained a signification of *unity*, as well as of *trinity*: but this much is at least evident, that Theophilus must have considered some resemblance, if not equality, to have existed between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or he would not have included them in the same type: and who would venture in any sense to speak of a trinity of beings, if one of the three was God, and the other two were created?

The next writer, who uses the word in the ecclesiastical sense, is Clement of Alexandria, who flourished a few years later than Theophilus. Like many of the fathers, he supposed Plato to have had a Trinity in view, when he wrote that obscure passage in his second Letter to Dionysius, Περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντ' ἐστί, καὶ ἐκείνου ἔνεκα τὰ πάντα· καὶ ἐκεῖνο αἴτιον ἀπάντων τῶν καλῶν δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα. Upon which Clement observes, “I understand this in no other way, than as containing mention of the blessed Trinity: for the third thing is the Holy Ghost, and the Son is the second.” Hippolytus, in a fragment of one of his works, speaks of “the knowledge of the blessed Trinity¹:” and in another, after reciting the form of words used at baptism, he adds, “For by this Trinity the Father is glorified^m. ” Origen also

^k Οὐκ ἄλλως ἔγωγε ἔξακονώ, ἦ Suicer.
τὴν ἀγίαν Τριάδα μνήσθαι· τρίτον
μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα· τὸν
Τόν δὲ δεύτερον. Strom. V. p. 710.
This passage also is omitted by

^l Τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀγίας Τριάδος. vol. I. p. 282.

^m See N°. 43.

frequently made use of the term. Several places are marked in the noteⁿ where the word *Trinitas* occurs in the Latin translation of Origen's treatise de Principiis: but I forbear to dwell upon these instances for the reasons given in N°. 44. The word *Trinitas* also occurs in the following places in Origen's Homilies upon Genesis, which only exist in the Latin translation of Rufinus, and upon the accuracy of which we cannot depend. Hom. II. 5. p. 64. IV. 6. p. 73. Also upon Exodus, Hom. IX. 3. p. 163: and though the word may in some cases have been added by Rufinus, we may be more inclined to think its insertion genuine, because in some fragments of Origen's commentary upon the Book of Numbers, where the original Greek has been preserved, we find the term *τριάς*. In a highly mystical interpretation of Numb. xxiv. 6, *as gardens by the river side*, he says, "they are intellectual "gardens, a place in which the trees of reason are "planted, watered either by the contemplation of "nature, or by the contemplation of the blessed "Trinity." The Homilies upon Numbers, like those upon the preceding books, were translated by Rufinus; but he does not profess to have rendered them accurately. The word *Trinitas* occurs in Hom. I. §. 3. p. 277. X. §. 3. p. 303. XI. §. 8. p. 310. XII. §. 1. p. 312. In translating the Homilies upon the Book of Joshua, Rufinus professes to have simply followed the original: and we may

ⁿ *De Princip.* I. 3, 2. p. 61. 189. §. 28. p. 190. §. 32. p. 192.
and again §. 4, 5. p. 62. The word will also be found in §. 7. ^ο Παράδεισοι ἐπὶ πόταμὸν εἰσι νηπτοί, τόπος ἐν φλογικὰ πεφύτευται π. 63. c. 5, 3. p. 66. c. 6, 1. p. 69. ἀρδόμενα ἥπται τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν γεγονό-
ib. §. 2. lib. II. c. 2. §. 2. p. 79. τῶν, ἡ τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος.
c. 4. 3. p. 86. lib. IV. §. 27. p. In Num. p. 273.

therefore conclude, that the author of them made use of the word Trinity, as in the following passage, where he is giving a figurative and fanciful meaning to what we read of nine tribes and an half being on one side of the Jordan, and two and an half on the other; so that neither was the number ten complete on the one side, nor the number three on the other: "In which I conceive this to be indicated, that those former people, who were under the law, possessed a knowledge of the Trinity; not however entirely and perfectly, but in part. For there was wanting to them in the Trinity a knowledge of the incarnation of the only begotten God ^{p.}.—Those tribes therefore were not two, lest the fathers should be without the faith and salvation of the Trinity; nor were they three entire and perfect, lest the mystery of the blessed Trinity should seem already complete in them ^{q.}." After quoting John xvi. 14. he continues, "You see that not only in the time of Moses is that number three shewn to be incomplete, but Jesus also says to his disciples, Ye cannot yet hear, unless the Comforter be come, the Spirit of Truth: because through him and in him is completed the perfection of the Trinity ^{r.}."

One of the most remarkable passages in support

^p In quo arbitror illud indicari, quod et illi priores, qui per legem agebantur, contigerint quidem scientiam Trinitatis, non tamen integre et perfecte, sed ex parte. Deerat enim illicis in Trinitate, etiam Dei unigeniti incarnationem cognoscere. Hom. III. §. 2. p. 402.

^q Propterea ergo tribus illæ

neque due sunt, ne patres extra fidem et salutem sint Trinitatis: neque tres integræ et perfectæ, ne beatæ Trinitatis in illicis jam sacramentum videretur expletum. Ib.

^r — quia per ipsum et in ipso adimpletur perfectio Trinitatis. p. 403.

of the Trinity is in Origen's first Homily upon the Book of Kings: and though this Homily only exists in a Latin translation, the author of which is unknown, yet we cannot doubt, that the sentiment at least proceeded from the original writer. "What," he says, "are those things, in which it is my duty " to speak in a lofty strain? When I speak of the " omnipotence of God, of his invisibility and eter- " nity, I speak in a lofty strain. When I speak of " the coeternity of his only Begotten, and his other " mysteries, I speak in a lofty strain. When I dis- " cuss the greatness of the Holy Ghost, I speak in " a lofty strain. In these things only is it allowed " us to speak in a lofty strain. After these three " things you should use no more lofty language. " For all things are low and mean, with reference " to the loftiness of this Trinity. Be unwilling, " therefore, to speak loftily upon many subjects, ex- " cept concerning the Father, and the Son, and the " Holy Ghost^s."

We have also the Greek word *τριάς* in Origen's commentary upon Psalm xvii. 16, *The foundations of the world were discovered at thy rebuke*; upon which he observes, "It is good also that the foundations of the world were discovered, that the blessed " Trinity might be seen, which has the command of

^s Quæ autem sunt, in quibus excelsa me loqui necesse est? Quando de omnipotentia Dei loquor, de invisibilitate et semipiternitate ejus, excelsa loquor. Quando de unigeniti ejus coæternitate cæterisque ejus mysteriis pronuncio, excelsa loquor. Quando de Sancti Spiritus magnificentia dissero, excelsa loquor.

In his tantum nobis conceditur loqui excelsa. Post hæc tria jam nihil loquaris excelsum. Omnia enim humilia sunt et dejecta, quantum ad Trinitatis hujus celstitudinem spectat. Nolite ergo multiplicare loqui excelsa, nisi de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto. §. 13. p. 488.

“ creation^t. ” Again, upon Psalm xxiii. 1, *The earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein*, Origen says, “ Not only “ the earth, and the fulness thereof, but also the “ world. The sinner dwells in the wilderness; but “ he that is in the church, which is filled by the “ blessed Trinity, dwells in the world, which is the “ church &c.^u ”

Origen’s commentary upon the 36th, 37th, and 38th Psalms was translated by Rufinus, who tells us, that he merely expressed what he found in the original. I therefore quote the following remarkable passage from this Latin version. After referring to Exodus iii. 3, he says, “ It is therefore *a great sight*, when God is seen with a pure heart. “ It is *a great sight*, when the Word of God, and “ the Wisdom of God, which is his Christ, is recogn-“ nised with a pure heart. It is *a great sight* to “ recognise and believe in the Holy Ghost. This “ *great sight* therefore is the knowledge of the “ Trinity ^x. ”

Again we have the Greek word *τριάς* in the commentary upon Psalm xxxvii. 22, *Forsake me not, O Lord my God, be not far from me*. Origen writes, “ This is a good beginning to prayer, *Forsake me not, O Lord my God, be not far from me; make haste to help me, O Lord my salva-*

^t Ἀγαθὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆ-
ναι τὰ θεμέλια τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἵνα
θεωρηθῇ ἡ ἁγία Τριάς, ητις ἄρχεται
τῶν κτισμάτων. vol. II. p. 607.

^u Ο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τυγχάνων
τῇ πεπληρωμένῃ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος,
οὗτος κατοικεῖ τὴν οἰκουμένην, ητις
ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία. p. 626.

^x *Magna ergo est visio, cum*

puro corde Deus videtur. *Magna*
est *visio*, cum puro corde Ver-
bum Dei, et Sapientia Dei, qui
est Christus ejus, agnoscatur.
Magna visio est agnoscere et
credere in Spiritum Sanctum.
Magna ergo hæc *visio* scientia
Trinitatis est. p. 670.

“ *tion*; for he has in himself also the blessed Trinity.” Again, upon Psalm xxxviii. 5, *Lord, make me to know mine end*, he observes, “ The end “ of reasonable nature is the knowledge of the “ blessed Trinity^z.” Again, upon Psalm lxi. 4, *I will abide in thy tabernacle for ever*, he writes, “ Every one that is perfect abideth in holiness for “ ever in that tabernacle: which is shewn in the “ following passage, *Who shall tabernacle in thy holy hill?* (Ps. xv. 1.) For this *abiding for ever* “ is the same with *the tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man.* (Heb. viii. 2.) But if such “ a tabernacle as this has such great perfection, as “ to be the holy of holies, yet there is after this a “ condition exceeding the powers of reason, accord- “ ing to which they will be in the Father and the “ Son, or rather in the Trinity^a.” Again, upon Psalm cxxxvi. 2, *Give thanks unto the God of gods*, after shewing the meaning of *gods*, he continues, “ The apostle also says, *though there be gods many and lords many in heaven and on earth,* (1 Cor. viii. 5.) yet that those who are called Gods, after “ the Trinity, are such by a participation of divinity: “ but the Saviour is God, not by participation, but “ in essence^b.” Again, upon Psalm cxlv. 3, *Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised, and of his greatness there is no end*, he writes, “ The contem- “ plation of all created things is bounded: but only

^a — ἔχει γάρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὴν ἀγίαν Τριάδα. p. 680.

^z Πέρας ἐστὶ τῆς λογικῆς φύσεως ἡ γνῶσις τῆς ἀγίας Τριάδος. p. 689.

^b Πλὴν εἰ καὶ οὕτῳ τελειότητος ἔχει ἡ τοιαύτη σκηνὴ, ὡς καὶ ἄγια ἀγίων εἶναι, ἀλλ’ οὖν ἐστι μετ’ αὐτῇ κατάστασις ὑπερέχουσα τῶν ἱ-

γικῶν, καθ’ ἣν ἔσονται ἐν Πατρὶ καὶ Τίῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τῇ Τριάδι. p. 739.

^b — ἀλλὰ τοὺς λεγομένους μετὰ τὴν Τριάδα Θεούς μετουσίᾳ θεότητος εἶναι τοιούτους· ὃ δὲ σωτήρ οὐ κατὰ μετουσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ’ οὐσίαν ἐστὶ Θεός. p. 833.

"the knowledge of the blessed Trinity is without end^c." Again, upon Psalm cxlvii. 13, *He hath strengthened the bars of thy gates*, "The bars of Jerusalem are the practical virtues, which hinder the enemy from entering: but the bars of Sion are the heavenly doctrines, and the right faith in the adorable and blessed Trinity^d." These two words, προσκυνητῆς τριάδος, contain in fact the whole doctrine of the Trinity: for they shew, that Origen united all the three persons as objects of the same adoration.

There are some very remarkable attestations to the doctrine of the Trinity, and repeated use of the term *Trinitas*, in the Latin version of Origen's commentary upon the Song of Solomon: but since Rufinus seems to have made a loose and paraphrastic translation, I shall only give references to some of the passages. They will be found in Prolog. p. 29, 30. lib. II. in Cant. i. 11, 12. p. 62. lib. III. in Cant. ii. 9. p. 83, 84.

The same may be said of Origen's Homilies upon Isaiah, which were translated by Jerom: in which, according to Rufinus, he took great liberties with the original, and removed objections from passages concerning the Trinity. This is expressly said of the first of the following passages, in all of which the word *Trinitas* will be found. Hom. I. 2. p. 107. Ib. 4. p. 107. Hom. IV. 1. p. 112: but the same testimony, which charges Jerom with interpolating the first passage, proves that Origen interpreted the

^c Πάντων μὲν τῶν γεγονότων ἡ θεωρία πεπέρασται· μόνη δὲ ἡ γνῶ-

^d Τῆς δὲ Σιών, τὰ οὐρανῖα δύο- ματα, καὶ ἡ ὄρθη πίστις τῆς προσκυ- σις τῆς ἀγίας Τριάδος ἐστιν ἀπέραν- νητῆς καὶ ἀγίας Τριάδος. p. 845.

two seraphim, mentioned in Isaiah vi. 2, of the Son and Holy Ghost.

In his commentary upon St. John, we find Origen speaking of a person committing himself at baptism “to the divine influence of the names of the adorable Trinity, which are then invoked ^e. ”

The word *Trinitas* is also found in the following passages of Origen’s commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans. Lib. III. §. 8. p. 514. lib. VII. §. 13. p. 611, 612. lib. VIII. §. ult. p. 642.

Methodius in his *Symposium* made use of the word *τριάς* and though we may condemn him for seeing an allusion to the Trinity in the sacrifice offered by Abraham, Gen. xv. 9, it is plain from the passage, that the word was in general use in his day ^f. But there is another passage in the same work, which shews still more clearly, that not only the name, but the doctrine of the Trinity, was well understood in those days. Having compared the stars, which are mentioned in Rev. xii. 4. to the heretics, he adds in the same allegorical strain which was then too common, “ Hence they are called “ *a third part of the stars*, as being in error concerning one of the numbers of the Trinity; at one “ time concerning that of the Father, as Sabellius, “ who said that the Omnipotent himself suffered; “ at another time concerning that of the Son, as “ Artemas, and they who say that he existed in appearance only; and at another time concerning

^e — τῷ ἐμπαρέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῷ θειότητι τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν τῆς προσκυνητῆς Τριάδος ἐπικλήσεων. Tom. VI. 17. p. 133.

^f [“] Α συμβολικῶς δάμαλιν ἔφη καὶ αἴγα καὶ κρίλν τριετίζοντα, οἷονει τὴν γνῶσιν ἀκακέμφατον τῆς Τριάδος ἐπανηγγρημένα. Orat. V. p. 92.

“ that of the Spirit, as the Ebionites, who contend
“ that the prophets spoke of their own impulse^g. ”

I have brought all these passages together, as shewing the use of the term *τριάς* among Greek writers, who lived in the three first centuries. Suicer has noticed very few of them.

10. *Theophili ad Autolycum*, 18. p. 362.

Theophilus, after making some remarks upon the creation of man, as recorded by Moses, says, “ We also find God speaking, as if he wished for assistance, *Let us make man after our image and likeness*. But He did not say, *Let us make*, to any other than to His own Word and His own Wisdom^h. ” Here again we find the term *Wisdom* applied to the Holy Ghost; though it might perhaps be thought, that Theophilus meant merely to speak of the Son, and to apply to him the two epithets of *the Word* and *Wisdom*. This however is rendered improbable by the preceding passage: and we find Irenæus expressing precisely the same sentiment: “ The angels did not make us, nor form us; nor could angels make *the image of God*; nor any one else, except the Word of the Lord, nor any power which was far removed from the Father of the universe. For God had no need of those to make what he had predetermined with

^g Οθεν καὶ τρίτων τῶν ἀστέρων ἐκλήθησαν μέρος, οἷον περὶ ἑνα τῶν ἀριθμῶν τῆς Τριάδος διεσφαλμένου, ὅτε μὲν τὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὃς Σαβέλλιος, αὐτὸν τὸν Παπτοκράτορα λέξας πεπονθέναι· ὅτε δὲ τὸν τοῦ Τίου, ὃς Ἀρτεμᾶς καὶ οἱ δοκῆσει αὐτὸν ἀποφηνάμενοι πεφυκέναι· ὅτε δὲ περὶ τὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὃς Ἐβιονᾶς, ἐξ ιδίᾳς κινήσεως τὸν πραφήτας λελαληκέναι φιλονεικοῦντες. Orat. VIII. p. 113.

^h Ἐτι μὴν καὶ ὡς βοηθείας χρήζων ὁ Θεός εὑρίσκεται λέγων, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὅμοιώσιν. Οὐκ ἀλλαφ δέ τινι εἴρηκε, Ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἡ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ σοφίᾳ.

“ himself to make, as if he had not his own hands.
 “ For there is always present with him his Word
 “ and Wisdom, the Son and Holy Ghost, by whom
 “ and in whom he made all things freely and volun-
 “ tarily; to whom also he speaks, when he says,
 “ *Let us make man after our image and likeness!*”

Irenæus expresses the same notion in another place; “ This is the Father, this is God, this is the Crea-
 tor, who made those things by himself, that is, by
 “ His Word and Wisdom^k. ” These passages are
 sufficient to shew, that it is not merely a modern
 interpretation, which finds an argument for the Tri-
 nity in the words spoken by God in Gen. i. 26; and
 Irenæus not only supposed the Son and the Holy
 Ghost to be present with God in the work of crea-
 tion; but he considered it to be indifferent, whether
 he spoke of God creating the world *by himself*, or
 by his Son and the Holy Ghost.

IRENÆUS, A. D. 185.

11. *Irenæi lib. IV. c. 4. §. 2. p. 231.*

Any passage, which speaks of the Father being in the Son, and the Son in the Father, may be quoted as an instance of belief in the doctrine of the Trinity. One of these, from the writings of Irenæus, has been given in my other work, N°. 49: “ It is “ by the Son who is in the Father, and has the Fa-
 ther in himself, that he, who is truly God, has

ⁱ Adest enim ei semper Ver-
 bum et Sapientia, Filius et Spi-
 ritus, per quos et in quibus
 omnia libere et sponte fecit; ad
 quos et loquitur, dicens, *Faci-*
amus hominem ad imaginem et
similitudinem nostram. IV. 20.
 1. p. 253.

^k Hic Pater, hic Deus, hic
 Conditor, hic Factor, hic Fabri-
 cator, qui fecit ea per semet-
 ipsum, hoc est, per Verbum et
 per Sapientiam suam. II. 30, 9.
 p. 163. See also IV. 7, 4. p.
 236. IV. 20, 4. p. 254. V. 6,
 1. p. 299. V. 28, 4. p. 327.

“ been manifested unto us.” The following passage is still more remarkable, in which Irenæus appears to quote from some other writer: “ He also spoke “ well, who said that the Father himself, who can- “ not be measured, is measured in the Son ; for the “ Son is the measure of the Father, since he also “ contains Him¹. ” The passage, when thus literally translated, is somewhat obscure and mystical : but to conceive of any being, that he is the measure of God, and that he contains or comprehends Him, who is immeasurable and incomprehensible, can only be reconciled with a belief in the divinity of that being. Irenæus expresses his own ideas upon this subject, when he says elsewhere, “ With relation to “ His greatness and marvellous glory *no man shall* “ *see God and live*: for the Father is incomprehen- “ sible^m. ” He here says that the Father is incomprehensible, *incapabilis*, and in the former passage he calls Him immeasurable, *immensus* ; and yet he says that the Son comprehends, *capit*, Him. Bishop Bull has some valuable remarks upon this passageⁿ: and he refers to the words of Irenæus in another place, where he is speaking of the Gnostic notion that “ Bythus and Sige produced Nus, which was simi- “ lar and equal to him who produced it, and which “ alone comprehends the greatness of its Father^o. ” The notion, like most of those connected with Gnos-

¹ Et bene, qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio men- suratum: mensura enim Patris Filius, quoniam et capit eum.

^m Sed secundum magnitudinem quidem ejus et mirabilem gloriam *nemo videbit Deum et vivet*; *incapabilis enim Pater.* IV. 20, 5. p. 254. In the same

section, where a fragment of the Greek is preserved, we find the terms ἀχάρητος καὶ ἀκατάληπτος.

ⁿ Def. Fid. Nic. II. 5. 4.
^o ——— Νοῦν, ὅμοιόν τε καὶ ἴσον τῷ προβαλόντι, καὶ μόνον χωροῦντα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ Πατρός. I. 1. 1. p. 5.

ticism, is involved in fable and absurdity : but it shews, that if a being is supposed to comprehend the greatness of God, it must also be supposed to be similar and equal to God.

12. *Irenæi l. IV. c. 14. §. 1. p. 243.*

I give the present passage, not merely as asserting the existence of Christ before all creation, (for the Arians did not deny this position,) but on account of the expression of the Son abiding *in the Father*, which, as I observed in N°. 11. is a direct support of the doctrine of the Trinity. “ For not “ only before Adam, but before all creation, the “ Word glorified his Father, abiding in Him^p. ” The reader will remember, that the expressions of *the Father being in the Son*, and *the Son in the Father*, are used on more than one occasion by our Saviour; John x. 38; xiv. 10, 11; xvii. 21—23. The Socinian and Unitarian interpreters explain these to mean, that there is an unity of counsel and operation between the Father and the Son ; and that the Son is in the Father, because he did not speak or work miracles of himself, but from the Father. The reader will judge, whether this was the sense in which such expressions were used by Irenæus.

13. *Irenæi l. IV. c. 20. §. 3. p. 253.*

The present passage might have been added in N°. 10. to those which were brought to prove, that Irenæus applied the term *Wisdom* to the Holy Ghost: but I quote it separately, as bearing a remarkable testimony to the divinity of the third person of the Trinity: “ That the Word, that is, the

^p Non enim solum ante Adam, sed et ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo.

“ Son, was always with the Father, I have proved at much length : but that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was with him before all creation, he says “ in the words of Solomon ^{q.}” Irenæus then quotes Prov. iii. 19, 20 ; viii. 22—27. which passages (as I have observed in my other work, N°. 28.) were constantly referred by the fathers to the second and third persons of the Trinity.

14. *Irenæi* l. IV. c. 20. §. 6. p. 254.

Some allusion to the doctrine of the Trinity will perhaps be found in the following passage, where the three persons are united in a manner which would hardly have presented itself, if the second and third persons were merely created beings. “ This then was the mode in which God was manifested; “ for God the Father is revealed through all these “ means, the Spirit operating, the Son ministering, “ and the Father approving, by all which together “ man’s salvation is completed ^{r.}” A similar idea may also be traced in the following passage, where the original Greek is preserved: “ Man, who was “ created and formed, was made after the image and “ likeness of the uncreated God ; the Father approv- “ ing and commanding ; the Son executing and cre- “ ating ; and the Holy Ghost supplying nourish- “ ment and increase ^{s.}”

^q Et quoniam Verbum, id est, Filius, semper cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus. Quoniam autem et Sapientia, quae est Spiritus, erat apud eum ante omnem constitutionem, per Salomonem ait. A difference will be observed between the phrases *cum Patre* and *apud eum*, which were probably in the Greek μετά τοῦ πατρὸς and πρὸς αὐτόν. I have

translated *constitutionem* as κτίσιν.

^r Sic igitur manifestabatur Deus ; per omnia enim hæc Deus Pater ostenditur, Spiritu quidem operante, Filio vero ministrante, Patre vero comprobante, homine vero consummato ad salutem.

^s Ο γενητὸς καὶ πεπλασμένος ἄνθρωπος κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν

15. *Irenæi l. IV. c. 20. §. 12. p. 257.*

The following passage could only have been written in an age, when allegorical interpretation was eagerly followed: but I would add, that it could only have proceeded from a writer, who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity: “So also Rahab the “ harlot—entertained the three spies, who spied the “ whole country, and hid them in her house, i. e. the “ Father and the Son with the Holy Ghost †.” It is not my intention to defend Irenæus for this fanciful allegory. The fault was in the system, not in the individual writer; and whoever will consult Origen upon this passage, will find him not only interpreting the three spies to mean three angels, but indulging in many trifling speculations upon the name of Rahab and the whole of her history ^u. Irenæus, as will be seen, merely mentions the allusion, and does not dwell upon it: but I repeat, that the notion would never have entered into his mind, if he had not seen some kind of resemblance or equality between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

16. *Irenæi l. V. c. 18. §. 2. p. 315.*

“ And thus there is shewn to be one God the “ Father, *who is above all, and through all, and in* “ *all things.* The Father is *above all things*, and “ he is the head of Christ: the Word is *through all* “ *things*, and he is the head of the church: the “ Spirit is *in all of us*, and he is the living water,

*τοῦ ἀγενήτου γίνεται Θεοῦ· τοῦ μὲν
Πατρὸς εὐδοκῶντος καὶ κελεύοντος,
τοῦ δὲ Τοῦ πράσσοντος καὶ δημιουρ-
γοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ Πνεύματος τρέφοντος
καὶ αἴξοντος. IV. 38, 3. p. 285.*

[†] Sic autem et Raab fornicaria
suscepit tres speculatores,

qui speculabantur universam ter-
ram, et apud se abscondit; Pa-
trem scilicet et Filium cum
Spiritu Sancto.

^u In Lib. Jesu Nave, Hom.
III. 3. vol. II. p. 493.

“ which the Lord supplies to those who believe
 “ rightly in him, and love him, and know that *there*
 “ *is one Father, who is above all, and through all,*
 “ *and in us all*.” I have quoted this passage, not
 only as illustrating the belief of Irenæus himself,
 but as containing an interpretation of the words of
 St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 6. That
 this text might be considered to contain an allusion
 to the Trinity, had been my own notion upon the
 first perusal of this Epistle: and I subsequently
 found the idea confirmed by the passage now pro-
 duced from Irenæus. There can be no question,
 that Irenæus conceived St. Paul’s words to admit an
 application to the Son and the Holy Ghost, as well
 as to the Father. He probably had the same text
 in view, and applied it in the same way, when he
 said in another place, “ The Son has been present
 “ with his creatures from the beginning, and reveals
 “ the Father to all, to as many as the Father wishes,
 “ and when he wishes, and how he wishes: and
 “ therefore *in all and through all things* there is
 “ one God the Father, and one Word the Son, and
 “ one Spirit, and one salvation to all who believe in
 “ him.” Nor was Irenæus the only one of the
 fathers, who gave this meaning to the words of St.

* Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, et per omnia, et in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater, et ipse est caput Christi: per omnia autem Verbum, et ipse est caput Ecclesiæ: in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, et ipse est aqua viva, quam præstat Dominus in se recte credentibus, et diligentibus se, et scientibus quia unus Pater, qui est super

omnia, et per omnia, et in omnibus nobis.

y Ab initio enim assistens Filius suo plasmati revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult Pater: et propter hoc in omnibus et per omnia unus Deus Pater, et unum Verbum Filius, et unus Spiritus, et una salus omnibus credentibus in eum. IV. 6, 7. p. 235.

Paul. Hippolytus, in a passage which I shall quote more at length in N^o. 43. and which contains an express assertion of the doctrine of the Trinity, says, “The Father is over all, the Son through all, “and the Holy Ghost in all^z.” Origen’s commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans contains a similar allusion: but I only refer to the passage^a, because the Latin version of Rufinus cannot be depended on for its accuracy. Athanasius quotes the passage as indicative of the Trinity in several places, but particularly in the two following: “There is one God the Father, having his existence “in himself, inasmuch as he is *over all*; and re-“vealed in the Son, inasmuch as he extends *through* “*all*; and in the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as he “operates *in all* by the word which is in him^b.” And again; “And thus *one God* is preached in the “church, *who is over all, and through all, and in* “*all*: *over all*, as the Father, as the principal and “fountain; *through all*, by the Word; *and in all*, “in the Holy Ghost^c.”

The object of the present work does not lead me to consider whether the fathers were right in supposing St. Paul to allude to the three persons of the Trinity in Eph. iv. 6.^d But if any person should

^z Ο ὁν Πατὴρ ἐπὶ πάντων, δὲ Τίδες διὰ πάντων, τὸ δὲ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἐν πᾶσιν. Cont. Noetum 14. vol. II. p. 16.

^a Lib. VII. §. 13. p. 612.

^b Εἰς Θεός ὁ Πατὴρ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ ὁν κατὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων εἶναι, καὶ ἐν τῷ Τιῷ δὲ φανόμενος κατὰ τὸ διὰ πάντων διήκειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐν ἅπασι διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνέργειν. Orat. III. 15. p. 565.

^c Καὶ οὕτως εἰς Θεός ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κηρύγγεται, δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν^e ἐπὶ πάντων μὲν, ὡς Πατὴρ, ὡς ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγὴ^f διὰ πάντων δὲ, διὰ τοῦ Λόγου^g ἐν πᾶσι δὲ, ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἄγιῳ. Epist. I. ad Serap. 28. p. 676, 677. See also §. 14. p. 663.

^d Upon this subject see Waterland, vol. I. p. 6; vol. III. p. 60.

oppose this interpretation, he must oppose it upon the principle, that in all the three expressions, *above all, through all, and in all*, St. Paul had only in view God the Father: and he must then allow, even upon his own hypothesis, that the fathers applied expressions to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, which can only be applied properly to God the Father.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, A.D. 194.

17. *Clementis Pædagog.* l. I. c. 6. p. 123.

The following passage is quoted by bishop Bull, as “ a full and perfect confession of the most holy ‘Trinity^e:” and it is the more remarkable, because there is nothing preceding, which led Clement thus to apostrophize the three persons, or to mention the third person at all. He had been alluding to our Saviour’s words in Luke xi. 28, *Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it:* and the occasion, which called forth these words, leading him to speak of Christ being born of a virgin, he breaks out into the following exclamation: “ O mysterious wonder! The universal Father is “ one; the universal Word also is one; and the “ Holy Spirit is one, and this same Spirit is every “ where^f.” Beside the testimony here borne to the doctrine of a Trinity, the reader will observe, that ubiquity is ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

18. *Clementis Pædagog.* l. I. c. 7. p. 129.

In accordance with the remark made at the beginning of N^o. 11. the following passage is indicative of the doctrine of the Trinity: “ Since I have

^e Def. Fid. Nic. II. 6. 3.

^f Ω̄ δαιματος μυστικοῦ· εἴς μὲν ὅλων Δόγμα· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγνοῶν
εἰς, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν πανταχοῦ.
ὅ τῶν ὅλων Πατήρ· εἴς δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν

“ proved that we are all called *children* by the “ scriptures, and not only this, but that we who be- “ lieve in Christ are figuratively termed *babes*, and “ that the Father of the universe is alone perfect : “ (for the Son is in Him, and the Father in the “ Son :) it is time for me, according to the order “ which I am following, to explain the nature of “ our Instructor^g.” The words included in the par- enthesis seem to have been called for by some such train of thought as this. Having said that God the Father alone is perfect, Clement was aware that he might seem to exclude the Son from being perfect : and he meets such a remark by saying, that the perfection of the Son is implied and included in the perfection of the Father: for the Son is in the Fa- ther, and the Father in the Son. That this train of thought has not been attributed fancifully to Cle- ment, is evident from his own words in another part of this treatise; where, after quoting the magnificent prophecy of Isaiah, ix. 6. he exclaims, “ O the mighty “ God ! O the *perfect* Child ! the Son in the Father, “ and the Father in the Son^h!” Here Clement not only says, as in the first quoted passage, that the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father ; but he says expressly, not by implication and inference, that the Son, the mighty God, is *perfect*: and since he says in the other place, that the Father alone is perfect, the two statements can only be re- conciled by the addition, which is made by himself, that the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father ; which is in fact the doctrine of the Trinity.

ε — μόνον δὲ εἶναι τέλειον τὸν τελείου παιδίον· Τίδες ἐν Πατρὶ, καὶ Πατέρα τῶν ὅλων· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν Τιῷ. The passage is Τίδες, καὶ ἐν τῷ Τιῷ ὁ πατήρ. quoted in my other work, No.
h *Ω τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ· ὃ τοῦ 75.

The same notion is also expressed in the following passage, where, after enumerating the different epithets and attributes of God, he concludes, “ So that “ it is evident that the God of the universe is one, “ and one only, good, just, the Creator, the Son in “ the Father, to whom be glory for ever and ever. “ Amenⁱ.”

19. *Clementis Pædagog.* l. I. c. 8. p. 135.

The following passage was quoted incidentally in my former work, N^o. 80. “ Nothing therefore is “ hated by God, nor yet by the Word, for both are “ one, God: for he says, *In the beginning the Word was in God, and the Word was God*^k. ” This same idea of *both being one* is found still more strongly expressed at the end of this treatise, where Clement addresses a prayer to the Logos, and begins it with these words, which it is difficult to translate: “ Be merciful, Instructor, to thy children, O Father, “ the Director of Israel, Son and Father, both one, “ Lord^l. ”

20. *Clementis Pædagog.* l. III. c. ult. p. 311.

The next passage is obscure, and difficult to be translated: but, as bishop Bull justly observes, “ in “ meridiana luce cæcutit, qui non clare videt, in hac “ δόξολογίᾳ, plenam et perfectam consubstantialis Tri-“ nitatis, hoc est, unius Dei in tribus personis, “ Patre nempe, Filio et Spiritu S. subsistentis, con-“ fessionem contineri^m. ” It is a continuation of the

ⁱ Ως εἶναι ταῖς ἀληθείαις κατα-
φανὲς τὸ [τὸν] τῶν συμπάντων Θεὸν
ἔνα μόνον εἶναι, ἀγαθὸν, δίκαιον, δη-
μιουργὸν, Τὸν ἐν Πατὴρ, φὴ δόξα εἰς
τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. I.
8. p. 142.

^k Οὐδὲν ἄρα μισεῖται ἵππο τοῦ Θεοῦ·
ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου· ἐν γὰρ ἄμ-

φω, δ Θεός. See Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* II. 6. 4.

^l Ἰλαβι τοῖς σοῖς, Παιδαγαγὲ,
παιδίοις, Πατὴρ, ἡνόχε Ισραὴλ, Τὶς
καὶ Πατὴρ, ἐν ἄμφω, Κύριε. III. ult.
p. 311.

^m *Def. Fid. Nic.* II. 6. 4.

prayer, of which I have quoted the beginning in N^o. 19; and Clement asks leave to “offer praise “and thanksgiving to the only One, to the Father “and Son, Son and Father, to the Son, who is Instructor and Teacher, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, in whom are all things, “through whom all things are one, through whom is “eternityⁿ.” There may be parts of this sentence which are difficult to comprehend; but it is unquestionable, that the Son and Holy Ghost are united with the Father as objects of praise, and the Greek words can hardly admit any other construction than that which declares the three persons to be One.

21. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* lib. VII. c. 13. p. 881.

If Clement had not believed the Son to be equal with the Father, and in some sense identified with him, he could never have written the following sentence without blasphemy. “Does not our Saviour, “who wishes the Christian *to be perfect as the Father who is in heaven*, that is, himself; who “says, *Come ye children, hear from me the fear of the Lord*, (Psalm xxxiv. 11.) does he not wish “him to be worthy of receiving assistance from “himself^o?“ It would be sufficiently remarkable, that Clement makes Christ the speaker of those words in Psalm xxxiv. 11. but it is much more so,

ⁿ Αἰνοῦντας εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ μόνῳ Πατρὶ καὶ Τίβῃ, Τίβῃ καὶ Πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ Τίβῃ, σὺν καὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, πάντα τῷ ἐνι, δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα, δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα ἔνι, δι’ ὃν τὰ ἀεί. I should wish to read the last words thus, δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα, ἐν [ὃ καὶ] δι’ ὃν τὸ ἀεί.

εἴναι βουλόμενος ὁ σωτῆρ ἡμῶν ὡς τὸν οὐρανίον Πατέρα, τοιτέστιν ἕαυτὸν, ὁ λέγων, Δεῦτε τέκνα, ἀκούσατέ μου φόβον Κυρίου, κ. τ. λ.; The reader of Clement will readily understand why I have translated τὸν γνωστικὸν *the Christian*. I may refer to my Bampton Lectures, note 35.

^o Καὶ μή τι τὸν γνωστικὸν τέλειον

that in alluding to the passage, *Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect*, (Matt. v. 48.) he says that Christ proposed “the Father, “ i. e. himself,” as this model of perfection.

22. *Clem. Alex. Quis Dives Salvetur?* §. 33. p. 954.

Having given exhortations to charity, he tells the Christian not to regard the outward appearance, however mean or squalid it may be: “this figure is “ laid upon us from without, the covering of our “ entrance into the world, that we may be able to “ enter into this place of common discipline: but “ the unseen Father dwelleth within, and his Son, “ who died for us, and rose again with us^p.“ What follows is still stronger, and more expressive of the Trinity. “ This figure, which meets the eye, de-“ ceives death and the devil. For the internal riches “ and beauty cannot be discerned by them:—they “ do not know what sort of *treasure we bear in* “ *earthen vessels*, (2 Cor. iv. 7.) which is fenced “ round with the power of God the Father, and the “ blood of God the Son, and the dew of the Holy “ Ghost^q.“ I have alluded to the remarkable ex-“ pression of “ the blood of God the Son” in my other work, N^o. 11. but the passage strongly confirms the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as of Christ’s divinity. The term *dew* may be merely metaphorical, as in our liturgy, *pour upon them the continual dew of thy blessing*: or it may allude to the Holy Ghost accompanying the *water* of baptism.

^p Ὅλοι ἔνδον ὁ κρυπτὸς ἐνοικεῖ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ τούτου παῖς ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανὼν, καὶ μεθ’ ἡμῶν ἀναστάς.

^q Οὐκ ἐπιστάμενοι πηλίκον τινὰ θησαυρὸν ἐν ὄστρακινῷ σκεύει βαστά-

ζόμεν, δυνάμει Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ αἴματι Θεοῦ παιδὸς καὶ δρόσῳ Πνεύματος ἀγίου περιτειχισμένον. Dr. Hickes would read περιτειχισμένοι.

23. *Clementis Fragmentum*, p. 1019.

Archbishop Potter extracted this fragment from a MS. in the Bodleian Library^r, which contains a work of Macarius Chrysocephalus^s upon the gospel of St. Matthew. The fragment begins thus: Οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην σὸν ὄμοιόσιν ὁ παράκλητος ἐνταῦθα λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ περιστερᾶς. The same fragment was also published by Fabricius, in his edition of Hippolytus, (vol. II. p. 71. Append.) with this variation, that instead of ὁ παράκλητος, he reads ὁ Θεός. Fabricius quotes the same MS. which was copied by Potter, and also another in the same library^t. The latter MS. contains another work of Macarius upon the gospel of St. Luke, in which a small part of the same passage is quoted from Clement of Alexandria: but it is there given as follows: Οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην ὄμοιόσιν ἐνταῦθα τοῦ Θεοῦ παρειληφότος, ἀλλὰ τὸ περιστερᾶς εἶδος. This variation is stated correctly by Potter, as I have observed by an inspection of the MSS., and Fabricius, perhaps, had not an accurate collation. There can be no doubt that the second reading is the correct one. It is confirmed by a Greek catena upon St. Luke, in a MS. at Vienna^u; and by one published in Latin by Corderius^x, in which we read, “ Non hic hominis, “ sed columbæ similitudinem Deus assumpsit:” so that we have here the remarkable expression “ of “ God having assumed, not the likeness of man, but “ the form of a dove.”

^r Baroc. 156. in Mat. l. VIII. fol. 98. p. 2.

^s He was archbishop of Philadelphia, but Cave is unable to fix his date. Fabricius is inclined to place him in the four-

teenth century. Bibl. Gr. vol. VII. p. 771.

^t Baroc. 211. in Luc. l. VII. c. 13.

^u Cod. XLII. Theol. Lambec.

^x In Luc. c. iii. No. 33.

TERTULLIANUS, A. D. 200.

24. *Tertulliani Apol.* c. 21. p. 19.

Having spoken of the Son of God as the Logos or Word, he says, “ We have learnt that he was “ put forth from God, and begotten by being put “ forth, and was therefore called the Son of God, “ and God, from unity of substance: for God is a “ Spirit. And when a ray is put forth from the “ sun, a part from the whole, yet the sun is in the “ ray, because it is a ray of the sun, nor is the sub-“ stance separated, but extended. Thus Spirit pro-“ ceeds from Spirit, and God from God, as one light “ kindled from another light. The original con-“ tinues entire and undiminished, although you bor-“ row from thence many derivatives. In the same “ manner what proceeds from God is God, and the “ Son of God, and both are one.” This passage requires no comment. I have already spoken, in my other work, N^o. 302, of the favourite illustration of the fathers, by which they compared the generation of the Son to the kindling of one light from another. Like all other illustrations or analogies, this is valid only in certain points, nor must it be carried beyond the proper bounds. The fathers did not mean to explain the *mode* of the divine generation, but merely to shew how one thing may proceed from another without the original being dimin-

^y Hunc ex Deo prolatum di-
dicimus, et prolatione genera-
tum, et idcirco Filium Dei, et
Deum dictum ex unitate sub-
stantiae. Nam et Deus Spiritus.
Et cum radius ex sole porrigi-
tur, portio ex summa, sed sol
erit in radio, quia solis est ra-
dius, nec separatur substantia,

sed extenditur. Ita de Spiritu
Spiritus, et de Deo Deus, ut
lumen de lumine accensum :
manet integra et indefecta ma-
teriae matrix, etsi plures inde
traduces qualitatum mutueris.
Ita et quod de Deo profectum
est, Deus est, et Dei Filius, et
unus ambo.

ished; and that the substance of both may be the same. The expression of the Nicene Creed, "God " of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God," is only a modification of the words used by Tertullian an hundred and twenty-five years before.

25. *Tertulliani de Oratione c. 2. p. 130.*

Among the passages of scripture which seem to support the unity of the Father and the Son, and consequently the doctrine of the Trinity, none are more plain and unequivocal than the declaration of our Saviour himself, *I and the Father are one*, John x. 30. The Socinian commentators contend, that this means an unity of counsel and action: "Ut voluntate ita operatione conspiramus: quicquid "ego volo, vult Pater; et quicquid Pater operatur, "per me operatur^z." "Penitus inter nos consenti- "mus et conspiramus.—Unum inter se dicuntur, "qui inter se uniti sunt, et plane consentiunt, unum "spirant; quod maxime locum habet inter filium "patri obsequentissimum, et patrem filii amantissi- "mum^a." Such are the Socinian explanations of this passage, though the author of the last notices the fact, that the Jews, who heard our Saviour deliver these words, put a very different construction on them, and took up stones to stone him, *because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God*. It is unquestionable, therefore, that the Jews understood something more than an unity of counsel: they thought, that if the Father and the Son are one, the Son as well as the Father must be God: and unless we believe that there are two Gods, we can only explain their unity according to the Trinitarian hypothesis. Tertullian appears to have taken the

^z Crellius ad locum.

^a Slichtingius ad locum.

same view of these words. In his treatise upon the Lord's Prayer, when he is explaining the first words of it, *Our Father, which art in heaven*, he says, “In addressing him as Father, we also call him “God. It is an appellation of affection and of “power. The Son also is invoked in the Father: “for *I*, he says, *and the Father are one*^b.” If Tertullian had understood our Saviour to have spoken merely of an unity of counsel and action, he could not have inferred, that the Son, as well as the Father, is always included in the invocation of the Lord's Prayer. See N^o. 45.

26. *Tertulliani de Oratione*, c. 25.

The following passage is not in the edition of Tertullian published by Priorius in 1675. The treatise *de Oratione* was printed for the first time by Gageneius at Paris in 1545, and was evidently imperfect. The edition of 1664 contained a few lines in continuation of the fourteenth chapter, which were supplied from a very ancient MS.: and in 1713 Muratori published at Padua, in the third volume of his *Anecdota*, nine additional chapters, which he found in a MS. in the Ambrosian library at Milan. The bishop of Lincoln is inclined to doubt the genuineness of these additional chapters^c: but they are admitted by Semler in his edition of Tertullian published at Hall in 1770, and again in 1824. In the fourth volume of that edition, c. 25, we have a dissertation upon the hours of prayer observed in the apostolical times: and the writer, after observing, that the third, sixth, and ninth hours are mentioned in the

^b Item in Patre Filius invoca-
tur; *Ego enim, inquit, et Pater*
unum sumus.

^c Eccles. Hist. of the Second
and Third Centuries from the
Writings of Tertullian, p. 406.

Acts of the Apostles, continues, “ Although no ob-
 servance of these hours is positively enjoined, yet
 it may be well to lay down some rule, which may
 enforce the exhortation to prayer, and drive us at
 times, as if by a law, to leave our business, and
 turn to such duties ; so that we may do, what we
 read was observed by Daniel according to the
 Jewish custom, and pray not less than three times
 a day at least, being under this obligation to the
 Father, Son, and Holy Ghost^d. ” Whatever trans-
 lation may be given of the last sentence, it seems
 plainly to declare, that we are bound to unite the
 three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in our
adorations: and perhaps we may find some con-
 firmation of the genuineness of this passage, when
 we see Cyprian also connecting the three Jewish
 hours of prayer with the Trinity, in a passage,
 which has considerable resemblance to this of
 Tertullian. Cyprian also wrote a treatise upon the
 Lord’s prayer, in which he says, “ We find that
 Daniel and the three children in offering their
 prayers observed the third, sixth, and ninth hours,
 as a sacramental type of the Trinity, which was
 to be revealed in the last times^e. ” The same idea
 may be traced in a contemporary of Tertullian,
 Clement of Alexandria, who writes as follows : “ If

^d Etsi simpliciter se habeant sine ullius observationis præcepto, bonum tamen sit aliquam constituere præsumptionem, qua [quæ] et orandi admonitionem constringat, et quasi lege ad tale munus extorqueat a negotiis interdum, ut quod Danieli quoque legimus observatum utique ex Israelis disciplina, ne minus ter die saltem

adoremus, debitores Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.

^e In orationibus vero celebrandis invenimus observasse cum Daniele tres pueros horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, sacramento scilicet Trinitatis, quæ in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat. *De Orat.* p. 214-15.

“ some allot fixed hours for prayer, as for instance
 “ the third, sixth, and ninth, the perfect Christian
 “ makes his whole life a course of prayer, being
 “ anxious through prayer to commune with God :
 “ —— but the triple division of these hours, and
 “ their being honoured by equal services of prayer,
 “ is known to those who are acquainted with the
 “ blessed trinity of the holy stations ^f.” The last
 sentence will be understood by those persons, who
 are familiar with the Greek term *μονή*, and the Latin
 term *statio*, in the early ecclesiastical writers; by
 which they meant to speak of certain fixed times
 and seasons for religious exercises, whether for
 prayer or fasting ^g. These were called *stations*; and it appears from this passage, as well as others, that three such stations were reckoned particularly holy and solemn.

I did not quote this passage at p. 38, among the other instances of the word *Trinity* being used by Clement, because no express allusion is made to the three persons of the Godhead; though I have little doubt, that the same fanciful notion, which was held by Tertullian and Cyprian, was also passing in the mind of the Alexandrian father: and though we may not agree with these writers in seeing any resemblance between the three hours of prayer and the three persons of the Godhead, yet the early writers must have been strongly impressed with the latter doctrine, or they would not have discovered for it such a fanciful analogy.

^f Άλλα καὶ τὰς τῶν ὥρῶν διανο- τριάδα μονᾶν. Strom. VII. 7.
 μὰς τριχῆ διεσταμένας, καὶ ταῖς p. 854.
 ἵσαις εὐχαῖς τετιμημένας, ἵσαις οἱ γνωρίζοντες τὴν μακαρίαν τῶν ἀρίων

^g See Du Cange v. *Statio*.

**27. Tertulliani de Cultu Fæminarum, lib. II. c. 1.
p. 154.**

It has often been observed, that St. Paul says in one place to his converts, *Know ye not, that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* 1 Cor. vi. 19; and in another, *Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* iii. 16; and the divinity of the Holy Ghost has been justly inferred from a comparison of the two places. Tertullian may be quoted as holding the same doctrine, and expressing it in terms which cannot be mistaken. “ Since we “ are all the temple of God, the Holy Ghost being “ placed within us and consecrated, Modesty is the “ priestess of that temple, which permits nothing “ unclean or profane to be introduced, lest the God, “ who dwells within, may be offended at the pollu-“ tion of his sanctuary and leave it ^h. ”

28. Tertulliani de Baptismo, c. 6. p. 226.

Having compared the water of baptism to the pool of Bethesda, he carries on the analogy by supposing an angel to give to the baptismal water its spiritual efficacy. “ The angel, who witnesses the “ baptism, prepares the way for the Holy Ghost “ which is to follow by the washing away of sins; “ which washing is obtained by faith, sealed in the “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For if *in three* “ *witnesses every word shall be established*, (Matt. “ xviii. 16,) how much more does the number of “ the divine names supply confidence to our hope,

^h Nam cum omnes templum Dei simus, illato in nos et consecrato Spiritu Sancto, ejus templi æditua et antistita Pudicitia est, quæ nihil immundum nec profanum inferri sinat, ne Deus ille, qui inhabitat, inquinatam sedem offensus derelinquat.

“ while we have in the blessing the same persons as
 “ witnesses of our faith, who are also the promisers
 “ of our salvation? But when the witnessing of
 “ our faith and the promise of our salvation are
 “ given under the pledge of three persons, there is
 “ necessarily added a mention of the church: for
 “ where the three are, that is, the Father, Son, and
 “ Holy Ghost, there is the church, which is the
 “ body of the threeⁱ!” This remarkable passage
 might lead to much discussion concerning the con-
 fession of faith, which was made anciently at bap-
 tism: and bishop Bull has quoted it to shew, that
 the article of belief *in the holy catholic church*, or
 at least *in the church*, was found in the creeds re-
 cited at baptism in the days of Tertullian^k. I shall
 only observe, that the Apostles' Creed, as we now
 use it, is an extension or expansion of a more sim-
 ple creed, which received successive additions in or-
 der to meet successive heresies. It is probable, that
 at first the catechumen said, “ I believe in God, the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;” and then the bap-
 tism followed in the name of these same three per-
 sons^l. This remark may illustrate the passage now

ⁱ Angelus baptismi arbiter
 superventuro Spiritui Sancto
 vias dirigit ablutione delictorum,
 quam fides impetrat, ob-signata in Patre et Filio et Spi-
 ritu Sancto. Nam si *in tribus testibus stabit omne verbum*,
 quanto magis, dum habemus per benedictionem eosdem ar-
 bitros fidei, quos et sponsores
 salutis, sufficit ad fiduciam spei
 nostre etiam numerus nomi-
 num divinorum? Quum autem
 sub tribus et testatio fidei et
 sponsio salutis pignerentur, ne-

cessario adjicitur ecclesiæ men-
 tio: quoniam ubi tres, id est
 Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus,
 ibi ecclesia, quæ trium cor-
 pus est.

^k Judicium Ecclesiæ Catho-
 licæ, VI. 7. He also quotes
 another passage from c. 11. of
 this same treatise, and one
 from Cyprian's 76th Epistle,
 which proves the same point.
 See also the bishop of Lincoln's
 work upon Tertullian, p. 318,
 430.

^l This is perhaps indicated

quoted from Tertullian : and I would observe, that when a person said, “ I believe in God, the Father, “ Son, and Holy Ghost,” the application of the term *God* to the second and third persons is more apparent than in the present expanded form of the Creed. The clause, which seems to have followed this confession in the days of Tertullian, was, *and in the church, or perhaps, and in the holy church.*

It is plain from this passage of Tertullian, that the form of words prescribed by our Saviour for baptism was used in his day : and he tells us in another place, that the person “ was immersed not “ once, but three times, at each of the names ”^m. If this form of words, as has often been shewed, is itself a strong confirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, we have certainly a right to add, that Tertullian viewed it in this light ; and the passage is so far available to my object. I do not intend to press it any further, nor to quote it as supporting the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. Tertullian has been supposed to allude to that text in another passage, which I shall adduce in N^o. 38. I cannot however subscribe to this notion : and I would merely observe, that the advocates for the authenticity of the text might refer with equal reason to the passage now before us, where the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are so expressly mentioned as *three witnesses.*

29. *Tertulliani adv. Marcionem*, l. II. c. 9. p. 386.

The divinity of the Holy Ghost is implied in the

in those words of Tertullian,
“ In aqua demissus, et inter
“ pauca verba tinctus.” De
Baptismo, c. 2.

^m Nam nec semel, sed ter,
ad singula nomina in personas
singulas tinguimur. *Adv. Prax-*
eam, 26.

following passage, in which Tertullian is exposing the error of the Gnostics, who made the Creator in some measure the author of evil, because the soul of man, which is *the breath of life*, was breathed into him by God: (Gen. ii. 7.) Upon which Tertullian observes, “We ought to have a clear idea of what “the soul is: and in the first place we must keep “to the meaning of the Greek term, which is not “*spirit*, but *breath*. For some persons, who have “translated from the Greek, without reflecting on “the difference, or regarding the propriety of words, “put *spirit* instead of *breath*, and give occasion to “the heretics of staining the Spirit of God, i. e. God “himself, with sinⁿ.”

30. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 2. p. 501.

The whole of Tertullian’s treatise against Praxeas might be cited as demonstrating his belief in the Trinity; but I shall only bring forward some of the plainest passages. Praxeas was one of the precursors of Sabellius, and confounded the persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, asserting the second and third persons not to be distinct beings, but merely modes or energies of the Father^o. Tertullian says of him, “He thinks that we cannot believe in “one God in any other way, than if we say that the “very same person is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; “as if *one* might not be *all*, (if *all* proceed from “*one*,) by unity of substance; and still the mystery

ⁿ Ad hoc interpretanda erit qualitas animæ. In primis tendum, quod Græca scriptura signavit, *adflatum* nominans, non *spiritum*. Quidam enim de Græco interpretantes, non recogitata differentia, nec cu-

rata proprietate verborum, pro *adflatu*, *spiritum* ponunt, et dant hæreticis occasionem Spiritum Dei delicto infuscandi, id est, ipsum Deum.

^o I may refer to my Bampton Lectures, note 103. p. 588.

“ of the divine economy be preserved, which divides
 “ the unity into a trinity, pointing out three, the
 “ Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: but three, not
 “ in condition, but in order; not in substance, but
 “ in form; not in power, but in species; but of one
 “ substance, and of one condition, and of one power.
 “ — These persons assume the number and ar-
 “ rangement of the trinity to be a division of the
 “ unity: whereas the unity, which derives a trinity
 “ from itself, is not destroyed by it, but has its dif-
 “ ferent offices performed. They therefore boast, that
 “ two and three Gods are preached by us, but that
 “ they themselves are worshippers of one God; as
 “ if the unity, when improperly contracted, did not
 “ create heresy; and a trinity, when properly consi-
 “ dered, did not constitute truth^p.” It would be hardly
 possible for Athanasius himself, or the compiler of
 the Athanasian Creed, to have delivered the doc-
 trine of the Trinity in stronger terms than these.
 I shall only remark, that the unity of *substance*, or
 consubstantiality of the Father and Son, is here ex-
 pressly maintained: and the meaning, which Ter-
 tullian attached to the word *substance*, may be seen

^p Unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque et Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum dicat: quasi non sic quoque unus sit omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per substantiæ scilicet unitatem, et nihilominus custodiatur œconomie sacramentum, quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum: tres autem non statu, sed gradu; nec substantia, sed forma; nec potestate, sed specie; unius autem

substantiæ, et unius status, et unius potestatis.—Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem præsumunt unitatis; quando unitas ex semetipsa derivans trinitatem non destruatur ab illa, sed administretur. Itaque duos et tres jam jactant a nobis predicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt; quasi non et unitas irrationaliter collecta hæresim faciat, trinitas rationaliter expensa veritatem constitutat.

by what he says in another place, that the names of God and Lord are applied differently to the Deity; that the name of Lord implies his power, but "God " is the name of the substance itself, that is, of the "divinity".⁴

31. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 4. p. 502.

He goes on to shew, that he does not destroy "the monarchy," i. e. the unity and sole sovereignty of God, by believing the Father to be assisted in his government of the world by the Son and Holy Ghost. This would be the case, if he agreed with the Gnostics in imagining another God, independent of, and opposed to, the Creator: "but when I derive the Son from nothing else, but from the substance of the Father, when I suppose him to do nothing without the will of the Father, and to have obtained all power from the Father, how can I be said by this belief to destroy the monarchy, which I thus preserve by supposing it to be delivered to the Son by the Father? I would also have my expressions applied to the third order, because I conceive the Spirit to be derived from no other source, than from the Father by the Son".⁵

32. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 8. p. 504.

His argument having led him to speak of *the Word* as put forth from God, he observes that this putting forth, ($\pi\rho\beta\omega\lambda\eta$), when applied to the genera-

⁴ Deus substantiae ipsius nomen, id est divinitatis. *Adv. Hermog.* 3. p. 234.

⁵ Ceterum qui Filium non aliunde deduco, sed de substantia Patris, nihil facientem sine Patris voluntate, omnem a Patre consecutum potestatem, quo-

modo possum de fide destruere monarchiam, quam a Patre Filio traditam in Filio servo? Hoc mihi et in tertium gradum dictum sit, quia Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam a Patre per Filium.

tion of the Son, is very different from the sense given to the term by the Gnostics, when they speak of one æon producing another. “ The Word is “ always in the Father, as he says, *I am in the Father*: (John xiv. 20.) and always with God, as “ it is written, *and the Word was with God*: (i. 1.) “ and never separated from the Father, or different “ from the Father, because *I and the Father are one*. (x. 30.) This, which is the true sense of the “ word *probola*, (putting forth,) preserves the unity; “ in which sense we say that the Son was put forth “ from the Father, but is not separate from him. “ For God put forth the Word, as the root puts “ forth the shrub, and the fountain puts forth the “ river, and the sun puts forth the ray——nor yet “ is the shrub distinct from the root, nor the river “ from the fountain, nor the ray from the sun; as “ neither is the Word from God. According, there- “ fore, to the form of these analogies, I profess to “ speak of two beings, God and his Word, the Fa- “ ther and his Son. For the root and the shrub “ are two things, but united: and the fountain and “ the stream are two species, but undivided; and “ the sun and the ray are two forms, but adhering “ together. Whatever proceeds from another must “ be second with reference to that from which it “ proceeds, but it is not therefore separate. Where- “ ever there is a second, there are two things; and “ where there is a third, there are three things. “ For the Spirit is the third from God and his Son, “ as the fruit which comes from the shrub is third “ from the root; and the river which proceeds from “ the stream is third from the fountain; and the “ point which proceeds from the ray is third from

" the sun.—Always remember, that this is the rule which I follow, when I assert the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be not separated from each other^s."

33. Tertulliani adv. Praxeam, c. 11. p. 506.

Having quoted some passages of Scripture, in which God speaks of his Son, he continues, " You will make him a liar and deceiver and a false exponent of this faith, if, when he himself is son to himself, he ascribed the person of a son to another being, whereas all these passages of scripture prove the clear existence and the distinction of a Trinity^t." I need not observe, that this argument is directed against the Sabellian notion, which destroys the personality of the Son, and in fact makes God to be Son to himself, as Tertullian here

* Sermo ergo et in Patre semper, sicut dicit, *Ego in Patre*; et apud Deum semper, sicut scriptum est, *Et Sermo erat apud Deum*: et nunquam separatus a Patre, aut alias a Patre, quia, *Ego et Pater unus sumus*. Haec erit probola veritatis custos unitatis, qua prolatum dicimus Filium a Patre, sed non separatum. Protulit enim Deus Sermonem, sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et sol radius — nec frutex tamen a radice, nec fluvius a fonte, nec radius a sole discernitur, sicut nec a Deo Sermo. Igitur, secundum horum exemplorum formam, profiteor me duos dicere, Deum et Sermonem ejus, Patrem et Filium ipsius. Nam et radix et frutex duæ res sunt, sed conjunctæ: et fons et flumen duæ species sunt, sed indivisæ: et sol

et radius duæ formæ sunt, sed cohærentes. Omne quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit ejus necesse est de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum. Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt: et tertius ubi est, tres sunt. Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice: et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine; et tertius a sole apex ex radio — Hanc me regulam professum, quum inseparatos ab alterutro Patrem et Filium et Spiritum testor, tene ubique.

^t Tu porro eum mendacem efficias et fallacem et deceptorem fidei hujus, si cum ipse esset sibi filius, alii dabat filii personam; quando scripture omnes et demonstrationem et distinctionem trinitatis ostendant.

remarks. It will also be seen, that the word *persona* is used in this passage: and the advocates of Sabellianism would wish us to understand, that it merely means a character assumed, or a part performed, by some person: as when Cicero says of himself, “ I sustain myself three characters, (per-“ sons,) my own, that of the adversary, and of the “ judge^u. ” It is true that Cicero here uses the word *persona* in its original^x and classical sense: but to assume from such an instance, that this was the meaning given to the word by ecclesiastical writers is most illogical, and betrays little acquaintance with the works of the fathers. It is in fact a *petitio principii*; it is to assume the very point at issue. What we want to ascertain is, not what was the meaning given to the word by Cicero and classical writers: that may be learned from dictionaries and indices: but we wish to know whether this classical sense was retained by the fathers; or whether in course of time the word did not receive a new theological meaning. This can only be discovered by a perusal of the writings of the fathers: and if we find them using *persona*, according to its modern sense, for a separately existing being, for a person distinguished by individuality, it is in vain that the Sabellian refers to classical antiquity: the criticism may be correct, but it is irrelevant: and Cicero can no more acquaint us with the meaning of *persona*, as used by Tertullian or Jerom, than these late writers can enable us to illustrate Cicero.

^u Sustineo unus tres personas, meam, adversarii, judicis.

^x I perhaps ought not to say *original*: for *persona* seems to have signified properly and pri-

marily a mask worn by the actor: from whence its secondary meaning, or the first of its derivative meanings, was the character sustained by the actor.

In the passage which I have quoted from Tertullian, he is exposing the inconsistency of Sabellianism : and he says, that when God speaks of his Son, if he does not mean a Son in the proper sense of the term, i. e. a Being individually distinct, He deceives us by giving the *person* of a Son to another Being, or rather to Himself. Here the word *persona* is used by Tertullian in its classical sense : in which sense, no doubt, Praxeas used the terms “ *persona filii*, ” *the person of the Son* : but Tertullian goes on to shew, that the word *persona* had come to bear a different meaning, and was applied to the *persons* of the Son and the Holy Ghost, according to the doctrine which was held by the orthodox party. Having quoted some more passages which speak of the Father as having a Son, he concludes, “ These few instances will shew very plainly the distinction of the Trinity : for there is the Spirit who speaks, and the Father to whom he speaks, and the Son of whom he speaks. So the other words, which are spoken either to the Father concerning the Son, or to the Son concerning the Father, or to the Spirit, establish each person in his own individuality.” Unless we suppose Tertullian to have been advocating the doctrines which it was the express object of this treatise to confute, we must conceive him here to have used the word *person* in its theological, and not in its classical signification.

⁷ His itaque paucis tamen manifeste distinctio Trinitatis exponitur. Est enim ipse qui pronuntiat Spiritus ; et Pater, ad quem pronuntiat ; et Filius, de quo pronuntiat. Sic cætera,

que nunc ad Patrem de Filio vel ad Filium, nunc ad Filium de Patre vel ad Patrem, nunc ad Spiritum pronuntiantur, unamquamque personam in sua proprietate constituunt.

This is still more evident in the continuation of the same argument, which also shews Tertullian's interpretation of Gen. i. 26. " If you still take " offence at the number of the Trinity, as if it was " not connected in simple unity, I ask how does one " individual Being speak in the plural number? *Let* " *us make man* &c. when he ought to have said, *I* " *will make man* &c. as being one and singular. So " also in what follows, *Behold Adam is become as* " *one of us*, (Gen. iii. 22.) he deceives us, or is " amusing himself, by speaking in the plural, when " he is one, and alone and singular. Or was he " speaking to the angels, as the Jews explain it, be- " cause they also do not acknowledge the Son? or " because he was himself Father, Son, and Spirit, " did he therefore make himself plural, and speak " plurally to himself? The fact is, that he used the " plural expressions, *Let us make*, and *our*, and *to us*, " because the Son, a second person, His Word, was " united to him, and the Spirit, a third person, in " the Word. For with whom did he make man, " and to whom did he make him like? It was with " his Son, who was to put on the human nature, " and with the Spirit, who was to sanctify man, " that he conversed as with ministers and witnesses, " by the unity of the Trinity. Again the follow- " ing words distinguish between the persons, *And* " *God made man, in the image of God made he him.* " (Gen. i. 27.)^z Tertullian then goes on to speak of

^z Si te adhuc numerus scan-
dalizat Trinitatis, quasi non con-
nexæ in unitate simplici, inter-
rogo quomodo unicus et singu-
laris pluraliter loquitur? *Facia-*
mus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; cum de-
buerit dixisse, *Faciam hominem*
ad imaginem et similitudinem meam, utpote unicus et singu-
laris. Sed et in sequentibus,
Ecce Adam factus est tanquam

the Son as assisting the Father in all the works of creation, according to that passage in St. John, *by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made*, (i. 3.) after which he adds, “if this same being is God, according to the expression of St. John, *the Word was God*, you have two beings, one saying, *Let it be made*, another making it. But I have already explained in what sense you are to understand *another*, with reference to person, not to substance; to distinction, not to division. But although I every where hold one substance in three united beings, yet from the necessary meaning of words I must make him who commands, and him who executes, to be different beings^a. ”

It will perhaps be allowed from these passages, that Tertullian understood the Son and the Holy Ghost to be separately existing *persons*, according to the full meaning given to that term by Trinitarian writers.

unus ex nobis, fallit aut ludit, ut, cum unus et solus et singularis esset, numerose loqueretur. Aut numquid angelis loquebatur, ut Judæi interpretantur, quia nec ipsi Filium agnoscunt? An quia ipse erat Pater, Filius, Spiritus, ideo pluralem se præstans, pluraliter sibi loquebatur? Immo quia jam adhærebat illi Filius, secunda persona, Sermo ipsius, et tertia Spiritus in Sermone, ideo pluraliter pronuntiavit, *Facciamus, et nostram, et nobis*. Cum quibus enim faciebat hominem, et quibus faciebat similem? cum Filio quidem, qui erat induitus hominem, Spiritu vero, qui erat sanctificatus hominem, quasi cum min-

istris et arbitris, ex unitate trinitatis loquebatur. Denique sequens scriptura distinguit inter personas, *Et fecit Deus hominem, ad imaginem Dei fecit illum.*

^a Qui si ipse Deus est, secundum Joannem, *Deus erat Sermo*, habes duos, alium dicentem ut fiat, alium facientem. *Alium* autem quomodo accipere debeas, jani professus sum; personæ non substantiæ nomine; ad distinctionem, non ad divisionem. Ceterum etsi ubique teneo unam substantiam in tribus cohærentibus, tamen alium dicam oportet ex necessitate sensus, eum qui jubet, et eum qui facit.

34. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 13. p. 507.

Part of the following passage has been adduced in my other work, N°. 55, where I have considered the words of St. Paul in Rom. ix. 5. It is preceded by several quotations from the Old Testament, such as Gen. xix. 24; Psalm xlvi. 7, lxxxii. 6, cx. 1; Isaiah liii. 1; in which mention is made of more than one God or Lord: and Tertullian, like all the other fathers, interprets these expressions of the first and second persons of the Trinity. Being charged, in consequence of this interpretation, with preaching two Gods and two Lords, he denies it, and says, “We do indeed distinguish two, the Father and the “Son, and three with the Holy Ghost.—Not how-“ever that we ever name with our mouth two Gods “or two Lords, although the Father is God, and the “Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and each “is God^b.” He then observes, that though two Gods and two Lords are mentioned in the Old Testament, and before the coming of Christ; yet since his coming, when the heathen were drawn off from many gods to one, the Christians had been unwilling ever to speak of God in the plural number: “Therefore I will not in any way use the term “Gods or Lords, but I will follow the apostle; so “that if the Father and the Son are to be men-“tioned together, I would call the Father *God*, and “would name Jesus Christ as *Lord*. But I can “speak of Christ singly as God, as the same apostle “says, *of whom is Christ; who, he says, is God*

^b *Duos quidem definimus, et duos Dominos nunquam ex Patrem et Filium, et jam tres cum Spiritu Sancto, secundum rationem œconomiæ, quæ facit numerum—Duos tamen Deos et ore nostro proferimus; non quasi non et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, unusquisque.*

“ over all, blessed for ever. For I might call a ray
 “ of the sun by itself *the sun*: but if I am naming
 “ the sun, of which it is a ray, I will not immedi-
 “ ately call the ray also *the sun*. For although I
 “ would not make two suns, yet I would as much
 “ reckon the sun and its ray to be two things, and
 “ two species of one undivided substance, as God
 “ and His Word, as the Father and the Son^c.”

35. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 19. p. 511.

The following quotation is similar to the last, and, if possible, contains a still stronger attestation to the doctrine of a trinity in unity. “ If they are unwilling that the Son should be reckoned a second person with reference to the Father, lest a second should make two Gods to be named, I have shewn that two Gods and two Lords are in fact mentioned in scripture: and lest they should still take offence at this, I have given the reason, that there are not two Gods nor two Lords mentioned, except as the Father and the Son are two: and this not by a separation of the substance, but according to the divine economy^d; when we assert the Son to be not divided and separated from the Father;

^c Itaque Deos omnino non dicam, nec Dominos: sed apostolum sequar, ut si pariter nominandi fuerint Pater et Filius, Deum Patrem appellem, et Iesum Christum Dominum nominem. Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus, *Ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne.* Nam et radium solis seorsum solem vocabo: solem autem nominans cuius est radius, non statim et radium solem appell-

labo. Nam etsi soles duos non faciam, tamen et solem et radium ejus tam duas res, et duas species unius indivisæ substantiæ numerabo, quam Deum et Sermonem ejus, quam Patrem et Filium.

^d I find it almost impossible to translate the word *dispositione*, which answers to the Greek *okaropla*, concerning which I have made some remarks in my former work, N^o. 45. p. 70. (second edition.)

" and different, not in nature, but in order ; who
 " although he is called God, when he is named by
 " himself, does not therefore make two Gods, but
 " one, from the very circumstance of his being called
 " God from the unity of the Father e."

36. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 22. p. 513.

The remarkable words of our Saviour in John viii. 19, are thus commented on by Tertullian. " When asked, *where was the Father?* he answered, *that neither himself nor the Father was known to them*; in which he speaks of two persons as unknown : " *but if they had known him, they would have known the Father*: not as if he was himself Father and " Son, but because from their indivisibility the one " can neither be known nor unknown without the " other f."

37. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 22. p. 513.

Another passage in the same chapter of St. John's Gospel leads to this remark : " *I proceeded forth and came from God*: (viii. 42.) and yet they are

^e Si Filium nolunt secundum a Patre reputari, ne secundus duos faciat Deos dici, ostendimus etiam duos Deos in scriptura relatos, et duos Dominos : et tamen ne de isto scandalizentur, rationem reddidimus, qua Dei non duo dicantur, nec Domini, sed qua Pater et Filius duo : et hoc non ex separatione substantiae, sed ex dispositione, cum individuum et separatum [inseparatum] Filium a Patre pronuntiamus ; nec statu, sed gradu alium; qui etsi Deus dicitur, quando nominatur singularis, non ideo duos Deos faciat, sed unum, hoc ipso quod et Deus ex unitate Patris vocari

habeat. It is plain, that we ought to read *inseparatum* as in c. 22. p. 512. at ubi se negat esse solum, *Sed ego, inquit, et qui me misit Pater, nonne duos demonstrat, tam duos quam inseparatos?* immo totum erat hoc quod docebat, *inseparatos duos esse*.

^f Interrogatus ubi esset Pater, neque se neque Patrem notum esse illis respondens, duos dixit ignotos: quod si ipsum nossent, Patrem nossent; non quidem quasi ipse esset Pater et Filius, sed quia per individuitatem neque agnosci neque ignorari alter sine altero potest.

“ not separated, although he says that he *proceeded forth*, as some take advantage of this expression: “ but he proceeded forth from the Father as a ray “ from the sun, as a stream from the fountain, as a “ shrub from the seed ^{g.}” Tertullian seems to have given the right interpretation of this passage, by understanding ἐξῆλθον and ἤκω to contain different meanings. ἐξῆλθον relates to the generation of the Son by the Father, ἤκω to his being sent into the world.

38. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 25. p. 515.

Tertullian notices those passages, in which the Son speaks of sending the Comforter, and yet the Father was to send him: and upon those words of our Saviour, *All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shew it unto you*, (John xvi. 15.) he observes, “ Thus the union of the Father in the Son, and of “ the Son in the Comforter, makes three beings “ united one to the other: which three are one “ thing (unum), not one person (unus): as it is writ- “ ten, *I and the Father are one*, (John x. 30.) with “ respect to the unity of substance, not to numerical “ individuality ^{h.}” This passage has been quoted in support of the genuineness of 1 John v. 7: to which text Tertullian is supposed to allude, when he says, *which three are one*, “ qui tres unum sunt.” But if any argument is to be drawn from this passage, it

^g *Ego enim ex Deo exivi et veni: et tamen non separantur, licet exisse dixerit, ut quidam arripiunt hujus dicti occasionem. Exivit autem a Patre, ut radius ex sole, ut rivus ex fonte, ut frutex ex semine.*

^h *Ita connexus Patris in Fi-*

*lio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero: qui tres unum sint, non unus: quomodo dictum est, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*; ad substantię unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.*

would rather appear to be unfavourable to the genuineness of the text: for after saying, *which three are one*, Tertullian confirms the assertion by quoting, *I and the Father are one*: but had he already meant to quote the stronger and plainer passage in 1 John v. 7. he would hardly have proceeded to prove the unity of the three persons, by citing a passage, which asserts only the unity of twoⁱ.

39. *Tertulliani adv. Praxeam*, c. 30. p. 518.

I add this passage on account of its strong attestation to the divinity of the Holy Ghost. “ He “ poured forth the Holy Ghost, the gift which he “ had received from the Father, the third who bears “ the divine name, the third in the order of majesty “ —*who leads into all truth*, which according to the “ Christian sacrament is in the Father, and the Son, “ and the Holy Ghost. But it is a sort of Jewish “ creed, to have such a belief in one God, as that “ you refuse to reckon the Son together with Him, “ and after the Son the Spirit. For what other dif- “ ference is there but this between ourselves and “ them? What is the effect of the gospel, what is “ the substance of the New Testament, which says “ that *the Law and the Prophets were until John*, “ unless the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in whom “ we believe as three, make one God? It was the “ wish of God to give a new form to faith, so that a “ new belief might be held concerning his unity “ through the Son and Holy Ghost, that God might “ now be openly known under his proper names and “ characters, who formerly also was preached by

ⁱ See the Bishop of Lincoln's work upon Tertullian, p. 544.

"the Son and Holy Ghost without being under-
"stood ^k."

After the quotations which have been given from Tertullian, and particularly from his treatise against Praxeas, few of my readers can deny that he acknowledged a trinity in unity; that he believed the Son and the Holy Ghost to be each of them God, of the same substance or nature with the Father, and to be inseparably connected with Him, though each is a distinct person. Whoever consults the treatises from which these extracts are taken, will find that some of them were written after Tertullian had adopted the errors of Montanus. Allusions to this heresy will be observed in some of the passages which support the doctrine of the Trinity: upon which I need only refer to what was stated in my former work, that the opinions of Montanus were never objected to concerning the Trinity. It will be seen, that the word *Trinitas* is of frequent occurrence in the writings of Tertullian: and I have observed, that he uses the term *persona* in its modern theological sense. Semler informs us, that no writer before Tertullian had used either of these terms in

^k Hic interim acceptum a Patre munus effudit Spiritum Sanctum, tertium nomen divinitatis, et tertium gradum maiestatis—*deductorem omnis veritatis*, quæ in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto secundum Christianum sacramentum. Ceterum Judaicæ fidei ista res, sic unum Deum credere, ut Filium adnumerare ei nolis, et post Filium Spiritum. Quid enim erit internos et illos, nisi differentia ista? Quod opus Evangelii, quæ est

substantia Novi Testamenti, statuens *Legem et Prophetas usque ad Joannem*, si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritus, tres crediti, unum Deum sistunt? Sic Deus voluit novare sacramentum, ut nove unus credetur per Filium et Spiritum, ut coram iam Deus in suis propriis nominibus et personis cognosceretur, qui et retro per Filium et Spiritum prædicatus non intellegebatur.

a similar manner¹: a remark which it is impossible to disprove, because the writings of no Latin Father, prior to the age of Tertullian, have come down to us; but this very circumstance reduces the remark itself to a gratuitous assumption; and if Tertullian was not the first writer who held the *doctrine* of the Trinity, it is of no importance, whether he was the first to make this use of the term *Trinitas* or no. I would observe of this term, as of the Greek *τριάς*, that it has no necessary connection with the language of theology, nor does it of itself convey the notion of a trinity in unity. Trinitas merely signifies *three things*; and when Semler asserts, that Tertullian was the first writer who applied the term to the persons of the godhead, he makes an assertion which is extremely improbable. If a person had merely spoken of the three names repeated in the form of baptism, he would have been likely to call them *a trinity* of names. Praxeas, whose tenets were an anticipation of Sabellianism, might undoubtedly have spoken of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as *a Trinity*; meaning, that they were three modes or operations; so that the real question is, whether Tertullian delivered a doctrine concerning these three persons, which had not been expressed by any former writer. The German editor would have wished to insinuate this: but, as is usual with his school, he knew that more effect may be produced by suggesting an inference, than by making a direct assertion, which admits of being refuted; and whether the *doctrine* of a trinity in unity was held by writers who preceded Tertullian, I leave to the reader to decide.

¹ Note to the treatise *adv. Praxeiam*, c. 21.

It may be added, that, according to Jerom^m, Tertullian wrote a work *De Trinitate*, which is now lost.

HIPPOLYTUS, A. D. 220.

The treatise of Hippolytus against Noetus is a suitable companion to that of Tertullian against Praxeas. The two heretics nearly agreed in their sentiments, and both of them were forerunners of Sabellius; but Noetus appears to have been a more decided maintainer of the Patripassian doctrines. Hippolytus confuted him in a special treatise; and the following extracts from it will shew his own opinion concerning the second and third persons of the Godhead.

40. *Hippolyti contra Noetum*, c. 7. vol. II. p. 11.

“ If Noetus remarks that our Saviour himself “ said, *I and the Father are one*, (John x. 30.) let “ him attend and observe, that he did not say, *I and* “ *the Father am one*, but *are one*. For the word “ *are* is not used with reference to one, but it points “ to two persons and one essenceⁿ.” The reader will observe, that Hippolytus here uses the Greek term πρόσωπον, as Tertullian the Latin term *persona*, to imply *a person* in the modern sense of the term.

41. *Hippolyti contra Noetum*, c. 8. vol. II. p. 12.

“ He is compelled even against his will to ac-“ knowledge the Father God Almighty, and Christ “ Jesus, the Son of God, who is God and became “ man, to whom the Father subjected every thing

^m De Baptismo, c. 15. num. 106. and perhaps in Catal. Script. Eccles. where he calls Novatian's treatise *de Trinitate* an epitome of the work of Tertullian.

ⁿ Εὰν δὲ λέγεις, αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἑσμεν, ἐπιστανέτω τὸν νῦν καὶ μανθανέτω, ὅτι οὐκ εἴπεν δτι ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν είμι, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἑσμεν. Τὸ γάρ ἑσμεν οὐκ ἐφ' ἐνδος λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἔδει-

ξει, δύναμιν δὲ μίαν.

" except himself and the Holy Ghost, and that these
" are in this manner three^o. But if he wishes to
" know how God is proved to be one, let him under-
" stand that his essence is one, and as far as relates
" to his essence, he is one God; but with respect to
" the dispensation, his manifestation is threefold^p."

42. Hippolyti contra Noetum, c. 12. p. 14.

The following passage is important from its mentioning the third person of the Trinity as an object of worship. " It is thus that we contemplate the " incarnate word: through him we form a conception of the Father; we believe in the Son; we " worship the Holy Ghost^q."

43. Hippolyti contra Noetum, c. 14. p. 15.

In order to understand the following passage, we must remember that Noetus accused the orthodox party of believing in two Gods. Hippolytus, after quoting the beginning of St. John's gospel, observes, " If then the *Word is with God*, being himself God, " why would any one say that this passage speaks " of two gods? I never speak of two gods, but one; " yet I speak of two persons and a third dispensation^r, the grace of the Holy Ghost. For the Fa-

^o Καὶ τούτους είναι οὕτως τρία. Such is the Greek, as printed by Fabricius; but the Latin translation, which had been published before by G. Vossius, reads, " et hos esse vere tres," from which I should substitute οὕτως for οὕτως. Hippolytus perhaps meant to assert, that the three persons had a real existence, and were not mere modes or operations.

^p Ἀνέγκην οὖν ἔχει καὶ μὴ θέλων διδολογεῖν πατέρα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν οὐδὲ Θεὸν Θεὸν

ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, φ' πάντα Πατήρ ιπέταξε παρεκτὸς ἑαυτῶν καὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου, καὶ τούτους είναι οὕτως τρία. Εἰ δὲ βούλεται μαθεῖν, πῶς εἰς Θεὸς ἀποδείκνυται, γιγνοσκέτω ὅτι μία δύναμις τούτου, καὶ δύον μὲν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, εἰς ἑστί Θεός· δύον δὲ κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τριχῆς ἡ ἐπίδειξις.

^q Οὐκούν ἔνσαρκον Λόγον θεωροῦμεν· Πατέρα δι' αὐτοῦ νοοῦμεν, νιφδὲ πιστεύομεν, Πνεύματι δέγιφ προκυνοῦμεν.

^r Οἰκονομίαν, concerning which word I must again refer to my former work, N^o. 45. p. 70.

“ ther is one; but there are two persons; because “ there is also the Son; and the third is the Holy “ Ghost. The Father commands, the Son performs; “ and the Son is manifested as the means of our be- “ lieving in the Father. A dispensation of agree- “ ment is comprehended in one God, for God is one. “ For it is the Father who commands, the Son who “ obeys, and the Holy Ghost who gives wisdom. “ The Father is *above all*, the Son is *through all*, “ and the Holy Ghost is *in all*^s. We cannot form “ a conception of one God in any other way, unless “ we really believe in the Father, and the Son, and “ the Holy Ghost. For the Jews glorified the Fa- “ ther, but did not give thanks; (see Luke xvii. 14 “ —18.) for they did not acknowledge the Son. “ The disciples acknowledged the Son, but not in “ the Holy Ghost: wherefore they also denied him. “ The paternal Word therefore knowing the dispen- “ sation and the will of the Father, that the Father “ wished to be glorified in no other way than this, “ commanded his disciples after his resurrection in “ these words, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing “ them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, “ and of the Holy Ghost;* (Matth. xxviii. 19.) shew- “ ing that whoever omits any one of these does not “ perfectly glorify God. For the Father is glorified “ by this Trinity. For the Father willed, the Son “ executed, the Spirit manifested ^t.” There may be

^s An allusion to Eph. iv. 6.
See N^o. 16.

^t Εἰ δὲ οὖν ὁ Λόγος πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, Θεός ὁν, τί οὖν φῆσειν ἄν τις δύο λέγειν Θεούς; Δύο μὲν οὖν ἔρω Θεούς ἀλλ' ἡ ἓνα πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, οἰκονομίαν δὲ τρίτην, τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἀγίου

Πιεύματος. Πατὴρ μὲν γὰρ εἶ, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, δτι καὶ ὁ ιδιός, τὸ δὲ τρίτον τὸ ἄγιον Πιεύμα. Πατὴρ ἐντέλλεται, Λόγος ἀποτελεῖ, οὐδὲ δείκνυται, δι' οὐ Πατὴρ πιστεύεται. Οἰκονομία συμφωνίας συνάγεται εἰς ἓνα Θεόν· εἰς γάρ ἔστιν ὁ Θεός. 'Ο

expressions in this passage, which might seem at first sight to support the notion of the Son and the Holy Ghost being operations of the Father; but since Hippolytus wrote this treatise purposely to confute such a notion, it is plain, that this could not have been his meaning; and Hippolytus undoubtedly believed the Son and the Holy Ghost to be distinct persons. Concerning the other expressions, in which he speaks of the second and third persons being subordinate to the first, I would refer to bishop Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith, sect. IV. The doxology with which Hippolytus concludes this treatise has been given at p. 9.

ORIGENES, A. D. 240.

44. *Origenis de Principiis*, l. I. c. 6. p. 55.

I mentioned in my former work, that Origen's treatise *De Principiis* only existed in a Latin translation made by Rufinus, and that the translator had been strongly suspected of making several alterations. On this account we cannot place much dependance upon the arguments or expressions of Origen which are taken from this book. But though Rufinus may have altered certain phrases, and introduced passages of his own, he would hardly have

γάρ κελεύων Πατήρ, ὃ δὲ ὑπακούων Τίδις, τὸ δὲ συνειζόν ἄγιον Πνεῦμα. Ὁ ὡν Πατήρ ἐπὶ πάντων, ὃ δὲ Τίδις διὰ πάντων, τὸ δὲ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν πᾶσιν. Ἀλλας τε ἔνα Θεὸν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθ, ἐὰν μὴ ὄντως Πατὴρ καὶ Τίδης καὶ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν. Ιούδαιοι μὲν γάρ ἐδόξασαν Πατέρα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ηὔχαριστος, Τίδης γάρ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν. Μαθηταὶ ἐπέγνωσαν Τίδην, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν Πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, δι' ὃ καὶ ἡρήσαστο. Γινάσκων

οὖν δὲ πατρῷος Λόγος τὴν οἰκουμέναν καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς, διὰ οὐκ ἄλλως βούλεται δοξάζεσθαι δὲ Πατήρ ἡ οὐτως, ἀναστὰς παρέδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς λέγων, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ. τ. λ. δεκνύντων, διὰ πᾶς δὲ ἀν ἐν τα τούτων ἐκλίπη, τελείως Θεὸν οὐκ ἐδόξασεν. Διὰ γάρ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης Πατὴρ δοξάζεται. Πατὴρ γάρ ηθέλησεν, Τίδης ἐποίησεν, Πνεῦμα ἐφανέρωσεν.

given a new character to the whole tenor of any argument ; and we must suppose Origen to have spoken of the nature of the Son in some such terms as those which occur in the passage now before us.

I have often alluded to the favourite illustration of the Fathers, by which they compare the generation of the Son to the effulgence proceeding from light. Origen makes use of it very frequently, as I have shewn in my former work : but in the present instance he proves how utterly inadequate every such analogy really was. “ It is impossible,” he says, “ to compare God the Father in the generation of his only begotten Son, and in his mode of existence, to any man or other animal who begets : but there must necessarily be something special and suited to God, for which no comparison of any kind can be found, not only in existing things, but not even in thought and idea, so as for human thought to comprehend how the unbegotten God is made the Father of an only begotten Son. For the generation is eternal and everlasting, in the same manner as effulgence is generated from light. For he does not become a Son from without by spiritual adoption, but is Son by nature.” Origen then confirms this by passages of scripture, such as Heb. i. 3 : but he dwells particularly on Col. i. 15, where the Son is called *the image of the invisible God*. He considers in what sense the term *image* can be applied to the Son of

^u — sed ne in cogitatione quidem vel sensu inveniri potest, ut humana cogitatio possit apprehendere quomodo ingenitus Deus Pater efficitur unigeniti Filii. Est namque ita

æterna ac sempiterna generatio, sicut splendor generatur ex luce. Non enim per adoptionem spiritus Filius fit extrinsecus, sed natura Filius est. c. 4.

God: and having observed, that every son may be called the image of his father who begat him, he says, that in this sense the Son of God may be *the image of God*: “which image contains the unity “of nature and substance of the Father and Son^x.” If we could be certain, that these were the genuine words of Origen, we have here direct proof of his believing the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son: and the passage might be added to the others which I have noticed in my former work, N^o. 305, where I have shewn that the term ὁμοίσιος, *of one substance*, was not unknown to the Ante-Nicene fathers. As I observed above, something of this kind must have been said by Origen, though his words may have been altered by Rufinus. He believed Christ to be strictly and literally *the begotten Son of God*: and I have shewn in the Introduction to this work, that such a notion leads us necessarily to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Other passages, which assert the same doctrine, may be found in the following places of the treatise *De Principiis*, lib. I. c. 6. §. 4. p. 71. lib. III. c. 5. §. 8. p. 151. lib. IV. §. 37. p. 195. and the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost are asserted with equal plainness in the following places: lib. I. præf. §. 4. p. 48. c. 1. §. 3. p. 50. c. 3. §. 3. p. 61. and the last passage is so strongly worded, that the translator would hardly have ventured to introduce it, if it had not existed in the original: “Up to the “present time I have not been able to find any ex-“pressions in the scriptures, by which the Holy “Ghost could be said to be made or created^y. ”

^x Quæ imago etiam naturæ continet unitatem.
ac substantiæ Patris et Fili^y Usque ad præsens nullum

45. *Origenis c. Celsum l. VIII. §. 12.* vol. I. p. 750.

The following passage was partly adduced in my former work, N°. 261, where I observed, that the term *hypostasis* was used in Origen's time to express individual existence, i. e. personality. It also remarkably confirms the fact of Christ being worshipped. Celsus had said of the Christians, " If " they worshipped no other being but one God, " their argument against other persons would per- "haps have weight: but now they pay the highest " worship to this person who appeared so lately, " and yet they think that they commit no offence " against God, although his servant is worshipped " by them ^{z.}" To this Origen replies, " If Celsus " had considered the words, *I and the Father are* " *one*, (John x. 30,) and those spoken by the Son of " God in his prayer, *as I and thou are one*^a, (xvii. " 22,) he would not have thought, that we worship " any one else beside the supreme God: for he says, " *the Father is in me, and I in the Father*, (xiv. " 11: xvii. 21.) But if any one be inclined to fear " from this, that I am going over to those who " deny the Father and Son to be two persons, let " him observe that expression, *And of them that* " *believed there was one heart and one soul*, (Acts " iv. 32,) that he may understand that other, *I and* " *the Father are one*. We therefore worship one " God, as I have proved, the Father and the Son; " and our argument against other persons continues

sermonem in scriptis sanctis in-
venire potuimus, per quem Spi-
ritus Sanctus factura esse vel
creatura diceretur.

^z Νυνὶ δὲ τὸ ἔναγχος φανέτα
τοῦτον ὑπερθρησκεύοντι, καὶ ὅμως οὐ-

δὲν πλημμελεῖν νομίζοντι περὶ τὸν
Θεὸν, εἰ καὶ ὑπηρέτης αὐτοῦ θερα-
πευθήσεται.

^a Ως ἦγὼ καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐσμεν. Origen quoted from memory. The words are, καθός ἡμεῖς ἐν ἐσμεν.

“ valid : and we do not pay the highest worship to
 “ him who appeared so lately, as to a person who
 “ had no previous existence ; for we believe him
 “ when he says himself, *Before Abraham was, I*
 “ *am*, (John viii. 58;) and when he says, *I am the*
 “ *Truth*, (xiv. 6:) and none of us are so stupid as
 “ to imagine, that the substance of truth^b had no
 “ existence before the times of the coming of Christ.
 “ We therefore worship the Father of Truth, and
 “ the Son who is Truth, two in person, [or, in the
 “ mode of existence,] but one in unanimity, and
 “ agreement, and identity of will ; so that he, who
 “ has seen the Son, *the brightness of the glory, and*
 “ *the express image of the substance, of God*, (Heb.
 “ i. 3,) has seen in him the very image of God, God
 “ himself^c.” Origen saw the necessity and the dif-
 ficulty of steering between tritheism and Sabellian-
 ism : but this passage, even if it stood alone, would
 be sufficient to acquit him of either. That he wor-
 shipped the Son as God, is here expressly asserted :

^b Η τῆς ἀληθείας οὐσία. Origen probably meant, *substantial Truth*, or *Truth personified*, i. e. Christ. See my former work, N^o. 100.

^c Εἴπερ νεονήκει ὁ Κέλσος τὸ, ‘Ἐγώ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἔν ἐσμεν, καὶ τὸ ἐν εὐχῇ κ. τ. λ. οὐκ ἀν φέτο ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλου θεραπεύει παρὰ τὸν ἐπὶ πάσαις Θεόν.’ Ο γὰρ Πατὴρ, φρονί, ἐν ἑμοὶ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ. Εἰ δέ τις ἐκ τούτων περισκασθήσεται, μή πη αὐτομολοῦμεν πρὸς τὸν ἀναιροῦντας δύο εἶναι ὑποτάτεις Πατέρα καὶ Τίὸν, ἐπιστησάτα τῷ, ‘Ην δὲ πάντων κ. τ. λ. ίνα θεωρήσῃ τὸ, ‘Ἐγώ κ. τ. λ. ’Ενα οὖν Θεόν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, τὸ Πα- τέρα καὶ τὸν Τίον, θεραπεύομεν. καὶ

μένει ἡμῖν ὁ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλους ἀτενής λόγος· καὶ οὐ τὸ ἔναντι γέ φα- νέτα, ὡς πρότερον οὐκ ὄντα, ὑπερ- θρησκεύομεν· αὐτῷ γὰρ πειθόμεθα τῷ εἰσάντι κ. τ. λ. καὶ οὐχ οὕτω τις ἥμῶν ἔστιν ἀνδράποδον, ὡς οἰεσθαις ὅτι ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐσία πρὸ τῶν χρόνων τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιφανείας οὐν ἦν. Θρησκεύομεν οὖν τὸν Πατέρα τῆς Ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸν Τίον τὴν Ἀλη- θειαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πρόγ- ματα, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμ- φωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλή- ματος· ὡς τὸν ἐνρακότα τὸν Τίον ὄντα ἀπανήγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χα- ρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνρακέντα ἐν αὐτῷ, ὄντι εἰκόνι τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Θεόν.

he also as plainly declares, that he did not worship two Gods : and though what he says of *the unity of agreement* might appear, if taken by itself, to favour Sabellianism, it will be observed, that he speaks of the Father and the Son being two in *hypostasis*, which can only mean, *in person or individuality of existence*. It is important also to remember, that Origen took an active part in the controversy excited by Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia ; and it was principally owing to his arguments, that Beryllus recanted his errors. Eusebius, who relates this circumstance, represents Beryllus as maintaining, “that our Lord and Saviour had no preexistence in individual distinctness of being, before his appearance in the world ; and that he had no distinct divinity, but only that of his Father residing in himself^d.” This was nothing else than the doctrine, which was taught by Sabellius a few years later : and since Origen succeeded in making Beryllus abjure this error, his own orthodoxy and anti-Sabellian sentiments cannot be called in question.

I would again refer the reader to my former work, N^o. 261, note b, where instances are given of Origen’s use of the term *hypostasis*: and I would add the following passage, in which he uses another analogy for the unity of the two persons. Upon those words in Genesis xi. 1, *And the whole earth was one lip, and all had one speech*, he observes, “To those who do not understand the expression, “ *I and the Father are one*, (John x. 30,) and therefore fore deny the distinct personality of the Son, I

^d Τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν μὴ μίας· μηδὲ μὴν θεότητα ἰδίαν ἔχειν, προφεστάναι κατ’ ἰδίαν οὐσίας περι- ἀλλ’ ἐμπόλιτευομένην αὐτῇ μόνην τὴν γραφήν, πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδη- Πατρικήν. H. E. VI. 33.

“ would quote this passage, *And the whole earth was one lip, and all had one speech.*” Origen evidently meant to adduce this analogy, as shewing that unity may be predicated of persons who have a distinct existence. He did not mean to say, that the particular kind of unity was the same in both cases: but he argued, that unity may exist between persons who are individually distinct.

46. *Origenis in Genesim Hom.* XVII. §. 5. vol. II.
p. 108.

I have mentioned at p. 39, that Origen’s Homilies upon Genesis only exist in the Latin translation of Rufinus, which cannot be depended upon for accuracy. I have therefore only given references to several places where the word *Trinitas* occurs; and all of which, if literally translated, would demonstrate Origen’s belief of a Trinity in unity. The following passage is taken from the same Latin version; and the reader will wonder at the length to which the allegorical interpretation of scripture was carried. But this very circumstance inclines me to think that the passage is genuine, and not an addition of Rufinus; for Origen’s propensity to this method of interpretation is too well known: and, as I observed in N^o. 44. though Rufinus may have altered the language, yet the turn of thought, and the tenor of the argument, must have proceeded from the original author. He is commenting upon that part of the prophecy of Jacob which relates to Judah: *Judah is a lion’s whelp—who shall raise him up?* (Gen. xlix. 9.) and after saying, that a

^c Τοῖς μὴ νοῦσι τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ δοίσομεν τὸ, Ἡν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος Πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν, καὶ διὰ ταῦτο ἀρ- ἐν, καὶ φωνὴ μία πᾶσι. In Gen. νουμένοις ἵκεστασι θέλω Τιοῦ, προσ- vol. II. p. 34.

mystical exposition is most suited to the place, and that *the lion's whelp* signifies Christ, he proceeds to interpret his being *raised up* of his rising from the dead. He quotes Rom. viii. 11. as shewing that *God* raised him up; and again, his own words in John ii. 19—21. as speaking of *himself* raising up his own body. Origen then observes, “ Because he “ says that he himself raises up his own temple, and “ God is said to have raised him up, the prophet “ rightly says, as if struck with awe at such unity “ and indivisibility of Father and Son, *Who shall* “ *raise him up*?” It is unnecessary to disclaim any agreement with such fanciful expositions of scripture: and I merely quote the passage, as shewing how strongly the doctrine of the Trinity must have been impressed upon the mind of a writer who introduced it upon such an occasion as this.

The Homilies upon Exodus also furnish many remarkable testimonies to the doctrine of the Trinity; but the same doubt exists as to their genuineness, which attaches to the Homilies upon Genesis; for Rufinus expressly mentions, that he had made some additions in his Latin translation of them. I shall therefore only give references to the passages. Hom. V. §. 3. p. 145; Hom. VI. §. 5. p. 148; Hom. VIII. §. 4. p. 158.

The same may be said of the Homilies upon Leviticus. See Hom. XII. §. 3. p. 251; Hom. XIII. §. 4. p. 256; and upon Numbers, Hom. XII. §. 1. p. 313.

¹ Quia ergo et ipse se dicit suscitare templum suum, et Deus illum dicuntur suscitasse, recte propheta stupore tantæ Patris et Filii unitatis atque indiscretionis attonitus ait, *Quis suscitabit eum?*

47. *Origenis in Psalm. XVIII. 6. vol. II. p. 614.*

The following passage may be of use as shewing the interpretation affixed by Origen to certain passages of scripture. The words of the Psalm are, as translated by the LXX. *In the sun hath he set his tabernacle;* upon which Origen observes, “Our “Lord is the sun of righteousness, and the Father “dwelleth in him, according to the words, *I am in “the Father, and the Father in me:* (John xiv. “10.) and again, *The Father that dwelleth in me, “he doeth the works:* (ib.) and the apostle says, “*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto “himself,* (2 Cor. v. 19.^g)”

48. *Origenis in Psalm. CXXII. 2. vol. II. p. 821.*

Origen gives the following fanciful interpretation of those words, *As the eyes of servants look upon the hand of their masters, &c.* “The servants of “their masters, the Father and the Son, are the “body and spirit; and the handmaid of her mis-“tress, the Holy Ghost, is the soul; and the three “are the Lord our God; for the three are one^h. ” This passage has been advanced in support of the notion, that the disputed text in 1 John v. 7. is genuine, and was read by Origen in his copies of the New Testament. Though this inference will not perhaps be generally allowed, there can be no question as to the writer of this sentence having held the doctrine of the Trinity.

49. *Origenis in Jerem. Homil. XVIII. 9. vol. III. p. 251.*

The Septuagint version of Jeremiah xviii. 14. is

^g Ο κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ ἥλιος τῆς δι- πνεῦμα καὶ σῶμα παιδίσκη δὲ Κυ- καιοσύνης ἔστιν, ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ κατα- ρίας, τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ἡ ψυχή. σκηνοῖ ὁ Πατὴρ, κατὰ τὸ κ. τ. λ. Τὰ δὲ τρία Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἔστιν.
^h Δοῦλοι κυρίων, Πατέρος καὶ Τίοῦ, οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν.

very different from the Hebrew. It begins thus ; *Will breasts fail from the rock?* i. e. will the rock cease to pour out water ? and this mention of water leads Origen to quote Psalm xlii. 2. *My soul thirsteth for the living God* : upon which he asks, “ Who “ hath thus thirsted for the breasts of the rock ? “ *but the rock was Christ.* (1 Cor. x. 4.) Who hath “ thus thirsted for the Holy Ghost, so as to say, “ *Like as the hart panteth after the fountains of water, so panteth my soul after thee, O God?* “ (Psalm xlii. 1.) Unless we thirst for the three “ fountains of water, we shall find no fountain of “ water. The Jews seem to have thirsted for one “ fountain of water, which was God: but since they “ did not thirst for Christ and the Holy Ghost, they “ are not able to drink even of God. The heretics “ seem to have thirsted for Christ Jesus ; but since “ they have not thirsted for the Father, who is the “ God of the Law and the Prophets, for this reason “ they do not drink even of Jesus Christ. They “ also, who keep to one God, but set at nought the “ prophecies, have not thirsted for the Holy Ghost “ that is in the prophecies. For this reason they “ do not drink even of the fountain of the Father, “ nor of Him who cried in the temple and said, *If “ any man thirst, let him come to me and drink*ⁱ.

ⁱ Τίς οὖτας ἐδίψησε Θεὸν, ὁστ’ ἀν εἰπεῖν, Ἐδίψησεν, κ. τ. λ.; Τίς οὖτας ἐδίψησε τοὺς μαστοὺς τῆς πέτρας; Ή πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός. Τίς οὖτας ἐδίψησε ἀγίου Πνεύματος, ὁστ’ ἀν εἰπεῖν, Ὁν τρόπων κ. τ. λ.; Ἐάν μὴ τὰ τρεῖς πυργάς τῶν ὑδάτων διψήσωμεν, οὐδεμίαν πυργὴν τῶν ὑδάτων εὑρήσομεν. Ἐδόξαν δεδιψηκέναι μίας πυργῆς τῶν ὑδάτων τῷ Θεῷ Ἰη-

δαῖοι· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐκ ἐδίψησαν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἔχουσι πιεῖν οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐδόξαν δεδιψηκέναι οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἵρεσεων Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐδίψησαν τὸν Πατέρα, ὅντα νόμον καὶ προφητῶν Θεὸν, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ πίνουσι οὐδὲ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Οἱ δὲ ἔνα μὲν τηροῦντες Θεὸν, ἔξουδενούτες δὲ τὰς προφητείας, οὐκ ἐδίψησαν τὸ

“ (John vii. 37.)” It is plain that the three fountains of water are the three persons of the Trinity, and that Origen considered a belief in each of them to be indispensable.

50. *Origenis in Ezech. Homil.* IV. §. 5. p. 372.

“ When you belong to Christ, you will belong also to the Almighty Father; for they are one and of an united nature^k.” These homilies upon Ezekiel are preserved only in the Latin version of Jerom; but he speaks of having translated them faithfully, and I therefore quote from them this very strong expression, which has a close agreement with the following.

51. *Origenis in Matthæum*, tom. XIII. §. 19. vol. III. p. 597.

Upon those words of our Saviour, *Whosoever shall receive this child in my name, receiveth me*, Luke ix. 48. Origen immediately adds, “ Then, since the Father is inseparable from the Son, He is with the person who receives the Son^l.”

52. *Origenis in Matthæum*, tom. XVII. §. 14. vol. III. p. 789.

I have shewn in N°. 45. that Origen’s belief concerning our Saviour was decidedly opposed to Sabellianism. The following passage will prove the point still farther. Having observed that the multitude, who looked upon Jesus as a prophet, (Matt. xxi. 46.) did not rightly or perfectly understand him, he continues, “ We must not think that those are *for him* who have false conceptions concern-

Πνεῦμα τὸ ὄγιον τὸ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ πάντας οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς τῆς πατρικῆς, οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κεκραυγότος κ. τ. λ.

^k Cum fueris Christi, eris et

omnipotentis Patris, quia unum sunt unitæque naturæ.

^l Εἴτε ἔτει ἀχώριστός ἐστι τοῦ Τίου ὁ Πατὴρ, γίνεται παρὰ τῷ δεξιᾷ μένο τὸν Τίον.

“ ing him ; such as those who confound the idea of “ Father and Son, fancying the Father and Son to “ be one in person^m, distinguishing the one subject “ in conception only and in the namesⁿ. ”

53. *Origenis in Lucam Hom.* XXV. vol. III.

p. 962.

Origen's homilies upon St. Luke exist only in a Latin translation, which was made by Jerom : but there is every reason to think that he translated them literally : and the following passage shews very plainly what was Origen's opinion concerning the third person of the Trinity. It is also curious, as presenting an instance of that wild and irrational method of interpretation which was pursued by the Gnostics. “ Others, when they read, *I will send you a Comforter, the Spirit of Truth*, (John xiv. “ 16.) do not understand a person who is third after “ the Father and the Son, and a divine and sublime “ nature, but the apostle Paul^o. ”

54. *Origenis in Joannem*, tom. II. §. 6. vol. IV.

p. 60.

I have had occasion to observe, that the sentiments of Origen concerning the Trinity have furnished matter for much discussion among ancient and modern writers ; and that he has been charged with using expressions concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost which are inconsistent with the orthodox notion of their divinity. I have ventured, in

^m Τριστάτει. See my former work, No. 261.

ⁿ Οὐ νομιστέον γὰρ εἶναι ἵππει αὐτοῦ τοὺς τὰ ψεύδη φρονοῦντας περὶ αὐτοῦ· ὅποιοι εἰσιν οἱ συγχέοντες Πατέρας καὶ Τίον ἔννοιαν, καὶ τῇ ἑτοστάσει ἔνα διδόντες εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Τίον, τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ μόνη καὶ τοῖς

δύμασι διαιροῦντες τὸ ἐν ὑποκείμενον.

^o Alii legentes, *Mittam vobis Advocatum Spiritum veritatis*, nolunt intelligere tertiam personam a Patre et Filio, et divinam sublimemque naturam, sed apostolum Paulum.

concurrence with bishop Bull, to question the justice of the attacks which have been made upon Origen on these points: and the following is perhaps one of the passages, in which he has been suspected of lowering the third person in the Trinity to the rank of a created being. He is commenting upon those words at the beginning of St. John's Gospel, *All things were made by him*, (i. 3.) and he allows himself to enter into a discussion which might well have been avoided.

“ If it is true, that *all things were made by him*,
 “ we must inquire whether the Holy Ghost was
 “ made by him: for as it seems to me, if a person
 “ says that the Holy Ghost was made, and if he
 “ grants that all things were made by the Logos, he
 “ must necessarily admit that the Holy Ghost was
 “ also made by the Logos, the latter preceding him
 “ in order of time. But if a person does not choose
 “ to say that the Holy Ghost was made by Christ,
 “ it follows that he must call him unproduced, if
 “ he thinks that this passage in the Gospel is true.
 “ But there may be also a third opinion, beside that
 “ of admitting that the Holy Ghost was made by
 “ the Logos, and that of supposing him to be un-
 “ created^p, namely, the notion of there being no
 “ substantial individual existence of the Holy Ghost
 “ distinct from the Father and the Son^q.—We,
 “ however, being persuaded that there are three hy-

^p The word here is ἀγένητος, though a few lines above it is ἀγένητον: and since Origen was in each case noticing the same opinion, we might have expected him to use the same terms. The evidence of MSS. is very

little in these cases, and I should be inclined to read ἀγένητον in both places. In the translation I have followed the Benedictine edition.

^q This is clearly the Sabellian doctrine.

“ postases, [persons,] the Father, the Son, and the “ Holy Ghost, and believing that nothing is unpro- “ duced beside the Father, adopt this as the more “ pious and the true opinion, that all things being “ made by the Logos, the Holy Ghost is more “ honourable than all of them, and more so in rank “ than all the things which were made by the Fa- “ ther through Christ. And perhaps this is the “ reason why he is not also called the very Son of “ God, there being only one who by nature and “ origin is Son, viz. the only-begotten, who seems “ to have been necessary to the Holy Ghost, and to “ have assisted in forming his hypostasis, not only “ that he might exist, but also that he might have “ wisdom, and reason, and righteousness, and what- “ ever else we suppose him to have, according to his “ participation in those qualities which we have “ before mentioned as attributed to Christ.”

Ἐξεταστέον δὲ ἀληθοῦς ὅντος τοῦ, Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, εἰ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. Οἷμαι γὰρ διὰ τῷ μὲν φάσκοντι γεγ- τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ πρόεμένῳ τῷ, Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ἀναγκαῖον παραδέξασθαι ὅτι τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐγένετο, προεβιτέρου παρ' αὐτὸν τοῦ Λόγου τυγχάνοντος. Τῷ δὲ μὴ βιουλομένῳ τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγονέναι, ἐπειτα τὸ δργένητον αὐτὸν λέγειν, ἀληθῆ τὰ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τούτῳ εἶναι κρίνονται. Ἐσται δέ τις καὶ τρίτος παρὰ τοὺς δύο, τὸν τε διὰ τοῦ Λόγου παραδεχό- μενον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον γεγονέναι, καὶ τὸ ἀγένητον αὐτὸν εἶναι ὑπολαμ- βάνοντα, δογματίζων μηδὲ οὐσίαν τινὰ ἰδίαν ὑφεστάναι τοῦ ἄγιον Πνεύματος ἐτέραν παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Τίον. Ημεῖς μέντοι γε

τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχά- νειν, τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Τίον, καὶ τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγένητον μη- δὲν ἔτερον τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύ- σαντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς, προσιέμεθα τὸ, πάντων διὰ τοῦ Λό- γου γενομένων, τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα πάν- των εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει πάν- των τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγενημένων. Καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἵτια τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτοιὸν χρημα- τίζειν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μόνον τοῦ Μορογε- νοῦς φύσει Τίον ἀρχήθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὐ χρήσειν ἔουκε τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα, διακονοῦντα αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι καὶ λογικὸν, καὶ δίκαιον, καὶ πᾶν ὀπίκοτον χρὴ αὐτὸν γεῖν τυγχά- νειν, κατὰ μετοχὴν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιῶν.

Such is this extraordinary, and I must add, unfortunate, passage of Origen, which I have quoted at length, and have endeavoured to translate with the utmost fairness. If the reader should decide from it, that Origen did not believe the eternity of the Holy Ghost, he will think that the enemies of Origen were not without grounds when they questioned his orthodoxy. It is not my intention entirely to exculpate him. He is at least guilty of indiscretion in entering upon such perilous ground, and in speculating so deeply upon points, which after all must elude the grasp of human ideas and phraseology. But the testimony of Origen, even in this passage, is not without its value in the controversies which have arisen concerning the third person in the Trinity. In the first place, he distinctly notices the Sabellian hypothesis, and as distinctly declares that he did not maintain it. He held that there are three *hypostases* in the Trinity: which expression, as I have already explained it, can only mean that there are three *persons*. Secondly, he says that the relation between the Father and the Holy Ghost is such, that it would scarcely be improper to call the Holy Ghost the *Son* of the Father. He gives a reason why such a term is not applied; but he would never have said this, if he had believed the Holy Ghost, in the common sense of the term, to be *a creature*. Thirdly, what he says of nothing being *unproduced* (*ἀγέννητον*) except the Father, is strictly orthodox, and has always been the doctrine of the catholic church. The Son and the Holy Ghost have always been said to be derived from the Father; the one by generation, the other by procession: neither of them is self-existent,

and therefore neither of them is unproduced: but this doctrine was never considered to be incompatible with the eternity of the Son or the Holy Ghost^s. Origen seems to have considered himself bound by those words of St. John, *All things were made by him*, to include the Holy Ghost among the things which were made by Christ: and it was this which led him into his dangerous speculation. But the word which we translate, *were made*, does not necessarily imply *creation* in the ordinary sense of the term: it means, *were called into existence*: and though Origen undoubtedly understood from this passage, that the world was created by Christ, yet he makes an express distinction between the Holy Ghost and the works of creation. It appears from this passage, that he would have said of the Holy Ghost, ἐγένετο διὰ Χριστοῦ: and the western church never held any other doctrine, than that the Holy Ghost proceeded *from* the Father *by* the Son. Whether this was the notion which Origen meant to express, I would leave to others to decide. His words are certainly not opposed to it: and though I would again repeat my regret that he entered into such speculations, I must add, that neither Sabellians, Arians, nor Socinians can claim the authority of Origen as supporting their tenets. If he erred, it was a peculiar error of his own: and I would caution the reader not to draw his inference from this particular passage, till he has compared it with the other extracts from works of the same writer.

If we could be certain, that Origen's commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans was faithfully translated by Rufinus, the following passage might

^s See Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. iv.

be quoted as shewing his sentiments concerning the eternity of the Holy Ghost: but for the reasons alleged in my former work, I do not bring any separate testimony from this treatise. I can hardly, however, imagine that Rufinus inserted the whole of the following passage, or that the substance of it at least was not to be found in the original work of Origen. “I know that some persons misunderstanding the newness of the Spirit, (Rom. vii. 6.) have perverted it, to prove that the Spirit is something new, as not having existed before, and not known in ancient times: in which they are not aware that they are guilty of very grievous blasphemy. For this very Spirit is in the Law, he is in the Gospel, he is always with the Father and the Son, he always is, and was, and will be, as the Father and the Son.”

55. *Origenis in Joannem*, tom. X. §. 21. vol. IV.
p. 199.

The sentiments of Origen concerning the Sabellian hypothesis are expressed with equal plainness in the present quotation. “But since some persons are perplexed when they come to the question of the Father and the Son, adducing this passage, *We are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God, that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up*, &c. (1 Cor. xv. 15.) and other similar passages, which prove that he who raised was different from him who was raised;

^t *Novitatem sane spiritus scio blasphemare. Ipse enim Spiritus est in lege, ipse in Evangelio, ipse semper cum Patre et Filio est, et semper est et erat et erit, sicut Pater et Filius.* VI. 7. p. 58o.

“ and this, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*; (John ii. 19.) from which they think to prove, that the Son does not differ numerically^u [personally] from the Father; but that both being one, not only in essence, but also in subject, are called Father and Son, according to certain different ideas, but not in person; we must quote against them, in the first place, the passages which preeminently prove the Son to be different from the Father^x.

56. *Origenis in Joannem*, tom. XIX. §. 1. vol. IV.
p. 282.

“ I must observe, that our Saviour sometimes speaks of himself as if he was speaking of a man, and sometimes as if of a nature which is more divine, and united to the unbegotten nature of the Father^y. ”

57. *Origenis in Joannem*, tom. XX. §. 16. p. 330.

Origen compares the declaration of our Saviour, *I proceeded forth and came from God*, (John viii. 42.) with that passage in Micah, (i. 3.) *Behold the Lord cometh forth out of his place*: and though we may not agree with him in seeing a resemblance between the two passages, we cannot mistake his sentiments concerning the unity of the Father and the Son. “ When the Son is in the Father, *being in*

^u Ἀριθμός. See N^o. 5. p. 24.

^x Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ συγχέμενοι ἐν τῷ περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Τίοῦ τόπῳ, συνάγοντες τὸ, Εὐρισκόμεθα κ. τ. λ. καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμαιοι δηλοῦντα ἔτερον εἰναι τὸν ἐγείραντα παρὰ τὸν ἐγγεγραμένον, καὶ τὸ, Λύσατε κ. τ. λ. οἶον τὸ [οἴονται] ἐκ τούτων παρίστασθαι μὴ διαφέρειν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τὸν Τίον τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀλλ’ ἔν, οὐ μόνον οὐσίᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑποκειμένῳ τυγχάνοντας

ἀμφοτέρους, κατὰ τινάς ἐπινοίας διαφόρους, οὐ κατὰ ὑπόστασιν λέγεονται Πατέρα καὶ Τίον, λεκτέον πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρῶτον μὲν τὰ προηγουμένας κατασκευαστικὰ ῥῆτα τοῦ ἔτερον εἰναι τὸν Τίον παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα.

Υ Λεκτέον δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ὅτι ὁ σωτὴρ δὲ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, οὐ περὶ ἀνθρώπου διαλέγεται, ὅτε δὲ οὐ περὶ θειοτέρας φύσεως, καὶ ἡνωμένης τῇ ἀγενήτῳ τοῦ Πατρὸς φύσει.

“ *the form of God*, before *he lowered himself*, God
“ is as it were his *place*: and if any one thinks of
“ him, who, before *he humbled himself*, was *in the*
“ *preeminent form of God*, he will see his Son, who
“ had not as yet *come forth from God*, and the
“ Lord, who had not yet *come forth out of his place*.
“ But when with this condition of the Son he com-
“ pares that which results from his *taking the form*
“ *of a servant by humbling himself*, he will under-
“ stand how the Son of God *proceeded forth and*
“ *came to us*, and became as it were out of him who
“ sent him, though in another sense the Father did
“ not leave him alone, but is with him, and is in the
“ Son, as he also is in the Father. And unless you
“ understand in another sense, that the Son is in
“ the Father, as he was before he came forth from
“ God, there will seem to be a contradiction between
“ his *coming forth from God*, and the person who
“ came forth from God being still in God. Others
“ have explained the words *I proceeded forth from*
“ *God*, as *I was begotten by God*, who go on to
“ say that the Son was begotten of the substance of
“ the Father; as if the Father had his substance
“ lessened and made deficient by the substance of
“ his Son, which he had before—. These per-
“ sons also say, that the Father and the Son are
“ corporeal, and that the Father is divided, which
“ are the notions of men who have not the most
“ distant conception of an invisible and incorporeal
“ nature, which is properly his substance. It is
“ plain also, that they ascribe bodily place to the
“ Father, and suppose the Son to have come bodily
“ upon earth by changing from one place to another,
“ and do not look upon it as a change merely from

"one condition to another, as we understand it?" This remarkable passage may be added to the many which were quoted in my former work, N^o. 70. concerning the meaning of St. Paul in Phil. ii. 5—11. It removes all doubt as to Origen believing in the preexistence of Christ, and shews that he believed him in that previous state to have been united to God.

It has been argued from this passage^a, that Origen did not believe the Son to be of the same substance with the Father, because he condemns the opinion of those "who said that the Son was begotten of the substance of the Father." But this is entirely to mistake the meaning of Origen, who only condemned those persons who supposed the substance of God to be diminished by the substance

^z "Οτε ὁ Τίὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ ἐστιν, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, πρὶν ἔαντὸν κενώσαι, οἰονεὶ τόπος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός· καὶ εἴ τις γε νοήσαι τὸν πρὸ τοῦ κενώσαι ἔαντὸν ἐν τῇ προηγουμένῃ ὑπάρχοντα Θεοῦ μορφῇ, δῆθεται τὸν μηδέπω ἐξεληλυθότα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Τίὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Κύριον τὸν μηδέπω ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ τόπου ἔαντοῦ. Ἐπὰν δὲ ἐκείνῃ τῇ καταστάσει τοῦ Τίὸν συγκρίνῃ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἀγειληφέναι τὴν τοῦ δύναλον μορφὴν ἔαντὸν κενώσαντα, συνήσει πᾶς ὁ Τίὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐζῆθε, καὶ ἡκε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ οἰονεὶ ἔξω γεγένηται τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν· εἰ καὶ κατ' ἄλλον τρόπον οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν μόνον ὁ Πατήρ, ἀλλὰ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐστι, καὶ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ Τίᾳ, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ. Καὶ εἰ μὴ κατ' ἄλλον γε τρόπον νοήσαις εἶναι τὸν Τίὸν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, ὡς ἦν πρὶν ἐξέληθ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δόξει περιέχειν μάχην τὸ καὶ ἐξεληλυθέντα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἶναι τὸν ἐξεληλυθότα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔτι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.

"Αλλοι δὲ τὸ, Ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, διηγήσαντο ἀντὶ τοῦ, Γεγένημαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἷς ἀκολουθεῖ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας φάσκειν τοῦ Πατρὸς γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Τίὸν, οἰονεὶ μειουμένου καὶ λείποντος τῇ οὐσίᾳ, ἢ πρότερον εἴχε, τοῦ Τίοι—. Ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ σῶμα λέγειν τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Τίον, καὶ δημητρίσθαι τὸν Πατέρα, ἀπέρ ἐστι δόγματα ἀνθρώπων, μηδὲ ὅναρ φύσιν ἀρραγον καὶ ἀσύματον πεφαντασμένων, ὅσαν κυρίως οὐσίαν· ὅντοι δὲ δῆλον ὅτι ἐν σωματικῇ τόπῳ δόσαντο τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Τίὸν τόπον ἐκ τόπου ἀμεινῶντα σωματικῶς ἐπιδεδημηκέναι τῷ βίῳ, καὶ οὐχὶ κατάστασιν ἐκ καταστάσεως, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς ἐξειληφαμεν. Compare Origen de Princip. I. iv. c. ult. §. 28. p. 189. as quoted in my former work, N^o. 178.

^a Jackson, in his Dissertation, prefixed to his edition of Novatian, p. xl ix.

of the Son being taken from it. The proofs of Origen believing in the consubstantiality of the Father and Son will be found in N^o. 44.

With respect to Origen's commentary upon the Epistle to the Romans, since it only exists in the translation of Rufinus, which can be proved to be by no means literal, I shall only give references to the following places, where some strong expressions will be found in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Lib. I. §. 16. p. 472. Lib. III. §. 8. p. 514. Lib. IV. §. 9. p. 540. ib. §. 10. Lib. VIII. §. 5. p. 626. But Basil has preserved a fragment of the original Greek, in which Origen expressly speaks of "the divinity of the Holy Spirit ^b."

CYPRIANUS, A. D. 250.

58. *Cypriani Epist. LXXXIII. p. 131.*

I observed, in N^o. 39, that the word *Trinitas* is often applied by Tertullian to the three persons of the Godhead. Cyprian, who was bishop of the church, to which Tertullian belonged, used it in the same sense, as may be seen in the following passage. "When the Lord sent forth his disciples after his resurrection, he instructed and taught them how they were to baptize, saying, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* (Matt. xxviii. 18.) He implies a Trinity, "by the mystery of which all nations were baptized ^c." We find the same sentiment repeated,

^b De Spiritu S. c. 29. Αἱ ἱεραὶ τητος.
δυνάμεις χωρητικαι τοῦ μονογενοῦς, ^c Dominus post resurrectio-
και. τῆς τοῦ ἀγίου πνευματος θεό- nem discipulos suos mittens

and the same use of the word *Trinitas*, in another part of this epistle. “ When after the resurrection “ the apostles are sent by the Lord to all nations, “ they are commanded to baptize them in the name “ of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy “ Ghost. How then do some say, that a Gentile “ who is baptized out of the church, and even con- “ trary to the church, provided it be done in the “ name of Jesus Christ, any where and in any man- “ ner, can obtain remission of sins, when Christ “ himself orders all nations to be baptized in the “ full and united Trinity^d? ”

59. *Cypriani Epist. LXXIII.* p. 133.

Cyprian, as is well known, was inclined not to allow the validity of baptism administered by heretics: and the opinion of the early church concerning baptism, as well as concerning the Trinity, may be illustrated by the following passage. He asks, “ If they are not in the church, and what is more, “ if they act contrary to the church, how can they “ baptize with the baptism of the church? For it “ is no small and trifling concession which is made “ to heretics by our admitting their baptisms, since “ from thence begins the source of all faith, the “ saving entrance to the hope of eternal life, and “ acceptance with God for His servants who are to “ be purified and made alive. For if a person may “ be baptized by heretics, he may therefore obtain “ remission of sins. If he obtains remission of sins, “ he is also sanctified, and made the temple of God.

quemadmodum baptizare debe-
rent instruxit et docuit, dicens,
Data est mihi &c. Insinuat
Trinitatem, cuius sacramento

gentes baptizarentur.
^d — quando ipse Christus
gentes baptizari jubeat in plena
et adunata Trinitate, p. 135.

“ If he is sanctified and made the temple of God, I
 “ ask, of what God? If you say, of the Creator,
 “ I say that he cannot, because he does not believe
 “ in him. If you say, of Christ, I say that neither
 “ can he, who denies Christ to be God, be made the
 “ temple of Christ. If you say, of the Holy Ghost,
 “ since the three are one, I ask, how can the Holy
 “ Ghost be reconciled to him, who is at enmity either
 “ with the Son or the Father^e? ” It is plain, that
 Cyprian was speaking of the Gnostic heretics, who
 made the supreme God, and the creator of the world,
 to be two different beings: but the passage is most
 valuable, as shewing that Cyprian considered the
 name of God to apply to the Son and the Holy
 Ghost, as much as to the Father.

The words, “ *cum tres unum sint*, ” *since the three are one*, have also been quoted as one of the proofs, that 1 John v. 7. was found in the copies of the New Testament used by Cyprian: but the strongest passage in favour of that text is in the treatise *de unitate ecclesiae*, where after making several observations in support of unity, he adds, “ The Lord says, “ *I and the Father are one*: (John x. 30.) and again “ it is written of the Father and the Son and the “ Holy Ghost, *And these three are one*^f. ” It certainly appears from this passage, that Cyprian meant to quote the words, “ *et hi tres unum sunt*, ”

^e Si sanctificatus est, si templum Dei factus est, quæro, cuius Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit, quia in eum non credit. Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo

Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Filii aut Patris inimicus est?

^f Et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Et hi tres unum sunt. Page 195—6.

as *written* somewhere or other in the New Testament: and it is not denied by any person, that these words, or others equivalent to them, are written in 1 John v. 8: the question is, whether they are also written in 1 John v. 7. Those, who oppose the genuineness of the seventh verse, contend, that Cyprian meant to allude to the eighth verse; and that following the figurative interpretation, which was used by many of the fathers, he chose to say of the eighth verse, that *it is written*, i. e. it is to be interpreted, *of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*. Facundus, a bishop of the African church in the 6th century, appears to have understood Cyprian in this way. He writes as follows: “The apostle John in “his Epistle writes thus of the Father, and the Son, “and the Holy Ghost, *There are three that bear witness on earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three are one; by the spirit signifying the Father, by the water the Holy Ghost, and by the blood the Son.* Which testimony of the apostle John, Cyprian, in an epistle or book, “which he wrote concerning the Trinity, under-“stands to have been said of the Father, and the “Son, and the Holy Ghost: for he says &c.^{g.}” and then he quotes the very words of Cyprian in this passage.

I would observe upon this quotation from Facun-

^g Defens. I. 3. Joannes Apostolus in epistola sua de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto sic dicit, *Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt: in spiritu significans Patrem — in aqua vero Spiritum Sanctum significans, — in*

sanguine vero Filium significans. — Quod tamen Joannis Apostoli testimonium B. Cyprianus Carthaginensis antistes et martyr in epistola, sive libro, quem de Trinitate scripsit, de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto dictum intelligit. Ait enim, “Dominus &c.”

dus, that two things are undeniable: 1. that Facundus himself interpreted *the spirit, the water, and the blood*, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that he does not quote the seventh verse, but only the eighth. 2. That he also understood Cyprian to have given the same figurative interpretation to the three witnesses mentioned in the eighth verse. It will perhaps be observed, that Facundus quotes Cyprian's Epistle or Book *de Trinitate*, whereas the words cited above are taken from the treatise *de Unitate Ecclesiae*. But this does not really make any difference: for the words quoted by Facundus are precisely the same which are read in the treatise *de Unitate Ecclesiae*: and though we might think, that Cyprian inserted the same passage in two different works, still Facundus would have made the same remark upon each of them, and would have said, that Cyprian gave a figurative interpretation to the eighth verse. The question to be decided is, whether Facundus was right in this representation of Cyprian's meaning; i. e. whether Cyprian, when he said, "et iterum de Patre et Filio " et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, *Et hi tres unum sunt*," meant to say, that what we read of *the spirit, the water, and the blood*, is written and is to be understood of *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*. If we adopt this notion, the testimony of Cyprian is to be withdrawn from the number of those writers, who support the genuineness of the text: and it cannot be denied, that many of the fathers were fond of giving an allegorical meaning to the three witnesses mentioned in the eighth verse. It has been said in answer to this, that the custom of allegorizing this passage did not exist so early

as the time of Cyprian: but whoever will refer to Origen's Eighth Homily on Leviticus, §. 10 and 11, will find him alluding to *the mystery* of the water and blood, and quoting St. John as saying in his epistle, "that *purification* is made in the water and "the blood and the spirit^h:" after which he proceeds to other allegories upon the number *three*, and concludes with saying, "So that in every instance we are to understand that *purification* can "not be made without the *mystery* of the Trinityⁱ." This seems to leave no doubt, that Origen saw the mystery of the Trinity in the spirit, the water, and the blood: but if the Trinity had actually been mentioned in the verse preceding, it is hardly possible that Origen would not have quoted it, or would have been contented with proving the mystery by inference and allegory.

I have no inclination to dwell longer upon this disputed passage; and my subject does not require me to do so, except so far as the testimonies of the fathers are concerned. But having been led to consider the internal evidence in my Bampton Lectures^k, I would only observe, that the external evidence is capable of being summed up in a few words. There are only four Greek MSS. in existence which are known to contain the text: 1. Codex Ravii, which is at Berlin, and which has been proved to be a transcript of the Complutensian Polyglot^l.

^h Quod Joannes ponit in epistola sua, et dicit purificationem fieri in aqua, et sanguine et spiritu. Vol. II. p. 234.

ⁱ Ut ubique intelligamus purificationem fieri non posse sine mysterio Trinitatis, p. 235.

^k Note 85. p. 522.
^l See La Croze, *Thes. Epist.* Vol. III. p. 2. and particularly Untersuchung der Ravischen Grechischen Handschrift des Neuen Testaments, von G. G. Pappelbaum. Berlin 1785.

2. Codex Guelpherbytanus D. (Nº. 131 of Michaelis.) One of the MSS. preserved at Wolfenbuttel; but it is acknowledged to have been written in the seventeenth century, and is therefore deserving of no notice. 3. Codex Montfortianus, now at Dublin, the date of which has been controverted; but it is generally placed in the fifteenth century, if not still later. 4. Codex Ottobonianus, in the Vatican, which has only been collated lately at the suggestion of the bishop of Salisbury, through whose kindness I have received a facsimile of the disputed passage. There are therefore only two MSS. which in a critical point of view can be said to contain the text: and it is remarkable, that neither of these MSS. have furnished the text of our modern printed editions: and what is still more striking, *the text, as it now stands, is not to be found in any MS. whatever.* The latter fact will appear still plainer, if the evidence is also summed up concerning the printed editions.

The earliest edition of the Greek Testament, which contains the text, is in the Complutensian Polyglot, which seems to have been printed in 1514, but was not published till 1520 or 1522. In the interval between these periods, Erasmus published his first edition of the Greek Testament, in 1516; but it did not contain the disputed verse: neither did his second edition, which appeared in 1519: but in 1522 he put out a third edition, in which the seventh verse is inserted upon the authority of a “Codex “Britannicus,” which is generally conceived to be the Codex Monfortianus; for the text, as printed by Erasmus, agrees exactly with the latter MS. but the text of the Complutensian edition is different;

and neither of them agrees with the text of our modern printed editions. Erasmus altered the text in his subsequent editions, by prefixing the article respectively to the three words, *πατὴρ*, *λόγος*, and *πνεῦμα*, though neither of the two existing MSS. contains this addition. Robert Stephens also in 1546 printed the text, as it stood in the later editions of Erasmus, making only the slight variation of *ἄγιον πνεῦμα* for *πνεῦμα ἄγιον*, though the latter, it will be observed, is the reading of both the existing MSS. The edition of R. Stephens has formed the basis of all subsequent editions; and the disputed passage, as it now stands, follows the reading of Stephens.

The substance of what has been said will appear plainer by the following table, which contains the readings of the two MSS. Montfortianus and Ottobonianus; together with those of the Complutensian edition, the fifth edition of Erasmus, and that of R. Stephens, which last may be called the *textus receptus*: but since all these authorities agree in the first words of the seventh verse, *ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες*, they may be omitted in this comparative view.

Codex Montfortianus. Erasmi ed. tertia.	Codex Ottobonianus.	Ed. Complut.	Erasmi ed. quinta.	Ed. R. Stephani. Textus receptus.
ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ	ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ	ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ	ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
πατὴρ	πατὴρ	ὁ πατὴρ	ὁ πατὴρ	ὁ πατὴρ
λόγος	λόγος	καὶ ὁ λόγος	ὁ λόγος	ὁ λόγος
καὶ πνεῦμα ἄγιον	καὶ πνεῦμα ἄγιον	καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα	καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἄγιον	καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα
καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς	καὶ οἱ τρεῖς	καὶ οἱ τρεῖς	καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς	καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς
ἐν εἰσι	εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι	εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσι	ἐν εἰσι	ἐν εἰσι

My subject, as I have already stated, did not require me to enter into this detail: and after the

volumes which have been written upon this controversy, it may appear presumptuous to sum it up in so few words: but having expressed my opinion as not favourable to the genuineness of the text, I wished to explain to the reader the real state of the critical part of the question. It is of course a suspicious circumstance, that so short a passage should contain so many various readings: and it will be observed, that the newly collated MS., the Codex Ottobonianus, presents an entirely new reading, $\alpha\pi\delta\tau\alpha\eta\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$, and in the eighth verse $\alpha\pi\delta\tau\eta\varsigma\gamma\eta\varsigma$. But without pressing this point, the opponents of the text have a right to call upon the defenders of it, to say what it is, which they mean to defend. They cannot defend it, as it stands in the two existing MSS., for these two documents differ materially from each other, and one or both of them differ from the *textus receptus* in every clause. If we are called upon to defend the *textus receptus*, I answer, that it is not to be found in any existing MS., and we are defending the words, not of an inspired apostle, but of a printer, who lived at Paris in the sixteenth century.

60. *Cypriani Testim.* lib. III. c. 101. p. 327.

Whatever may be thought of Cyprian's judgment in the interpretation of scripture, there can be no doubt as to his opinion of the Holy Ghost, when he makes the title or subject of this chapter, "That " the Holy Ghost frequently appeared in fire," and brings the following passages in proof of it: " In " Exodus, (xix. 18,) *And mount Sina was alto-*
" *gether on a smoke, because God descended upon*
" *it in fire.* Also in the Acts of the Apostles, (ii. 2,) " *And suddenly there came a sound &c.* Also when-

“ ever God accepted sacrifices, fire came down from
 “ heaven, which consumed the offerings. In Exo-
 “ dus, (iii. 2,) *The Angel of the Lord appeared in*
 “ *a flame of fire out of a bush*^m. ”

NOVATIANUS, A. D. 257.

In my former work I quoted several passages from Novatian's treatise *de Trinitate*, all of which support the doctrine of Christ's divinity, and consequently (as is stated in the Introduction) the doctrine of the Trinity also. The title of this treatise might be sufficient to persuade us, that the author of it believed in the Trinity: and some of the extracts might perhaps have been more properly reserved for the present work: but having already made use of them with reference to the second person of the Trinity, I shall not repeat them here, and shall only adduce a few more, which have a more immediate connection with the Trinitarian controversy.

61. *Novatiani de Trinitate*, c. 12. p. 714.

Having quoted Isaiah xxxv. 3—6, which speaks of *God coming*, and having applied the passage to the coming of Christ, he continues, “ If the prophet says that these will be the signs at the coming of God, let them either acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, at whose coming, and by whom, these signs of miraculous cures were made; or, being overpowered by the truth of Christ's divinity, let

^m Spiritum Sanctum in igne ito &c. Item in sacrificiis quæfrequenter apparuisse. In Exodus, *Et mons Sina fumabat totus, quoniam descendebat Deus in eum in igne*. Item in Actibus Apostolorum, *Et factus est sub-* cunque accepta habebat Deus, descendebat ignis de cœlo, qui sacrificata consumeret. In Exodus, *In flamma ignis apparuit Angelus Domini de rubo*.

“ them fall into the other heresy, and refusing to
 “ confess Christ as the Son of God, and God, let
 “ them confess him to be the Father. For they
 “ cannot escape from the words of the prophets, and
 “ cannot refuse to call Christ Godⁿ.” Shortly after
 he says more plainly, “ Whom do they mean is
 “ come? If they say that Almighty God the Fa-
 “ ther is come, then God the Father comes from a
 “ particular place, from which he is therefore ex-
 “ cluded, and is confined within the limits of a par-
 “ ticular spot; and thus, as I said before, the sacri-
 “ legious heresy of Sabellius is confirmed by these
 “ persons^o.” Again at the end of the chapter, “ Let
 “ them then choose out of the two which they please,
 “ that he, who *is come*, is the Son or the Father:
 “ for *God* is said to *have come*. If they say, the
 “ Son, why do they hesitate to call Christ God?
 “ For the scripture says that it was God who was
 “ to come. If they say it was the Father, why do
 “ they hesitate to join themselves to the rashness of
 “ Sabellius, who calls Christ the Father? except
 “ that whether they say it was the Father or the
 “ Son, they will be compelled, however unwillingly,
 “ to depart from their own heresy, having been ac-
 “ customed to call Christ a mere man, and now

ⁿ Si in adventu Dei dicit prophetes hæc futura signa quæ facta sunt, aut Dei Filium agnoscant Christum, in cuius adventu et a quo hæc sanitatum signa facta sunt; aut divinitatis Christi veritate superati, in alteram hæresim ruentes, Christum dum Filium Dei et Deum confiteri nolunt, Patrem illum esse confitebuntur. Vocibus enim

prophetarum inclusi jam Christianum Deum negare non possunt.

^o Quem volunt isti venire? Si venisse aiunt Omnipotentem Deum Patrem, ergo de loco Deus Pater venit, ex quo etiam loco cluditur, et intra sedis alius angustias continetur; et jam per istos, ut diximus, Sabelliana hæresis sacrilega corporatur.

“ being compelled to put him forward as God, whether they choose to call him the Father or the Son.”

Whatever we may think of such texts as *Isaiah xxxv. 4. Habaccuc iii. 3, &c.* being applied to Christ, the fact of Novatian's own belief is not affected by these interpretations. We may ascertain his own tenets, by observing the tenets which he refutes: and nothing can be plainer, than that he first opposes the notion of Christ being a mere man; and then argues, that the maintainer of this heresy will be compelled to run into Sabellianism. Sabellius had risen into notice in Novatian's own time; and we here see the manner in which this hypothesis was spoken of by a contemporary writer of the Roman church.

62. *Novatiani de Trinitate*, c. 21. p. 720.

The same argument against Sabellius is continued in the present quotation. “ But because Christ is proved by the authority of holy scripture to be not only man, but God, other heretics^a break forth, and try to shake the character of Christ's religion, wishing to shew by this very argument that Christ is God the Father, since he is asserted to be not

^p Eligant ergo ex duobus quid velint, hunc qui ab Africo venit, Filium esse an Patrem: Deus enim dicitur ab Africo venturus. Si Filium, quid dubitant Christum et Deum dicere? Deum enim scriptura dicit esse venturum. Si Patrem, quid dubitant cum Sabellii temeritate misceri, qui Christum Patrem dicit? nisi quoniam sive illum Patrem sive Filium dixerint, ab hæresi sua, inviti licet, desciscant necesse

est, qui Christum hominem tantummodo solent dicere: dum illum rebus ipsis coacti Deum incipiunt promere, sive dum illum Patrem sive dum illum Filium voluerint nuncupare.

^q In the interval between the last quotation and the present, he had been refuting the heretics, who considered Christ to be a mere man, and he now returns to the Sabellians.

“ only man, but also God. For they argue thus :
 “ If it be allowed that there is only one God, but
 “ Christ is God ; therefore if the Father and Christ
 “ is one God, Christ must be said to be the Father.
 “ In which argument they are convicted of error,
 “ because they do not know Christ, but merely re-
 “ cognise the sound of the word : for they refuse to
 “ acknowledge him as the second person after the
 “ Father, but as the Father himself. To whom I
 “ shall say but a few words, because the answer is
 “ easy. For who would not acknowledge that there
 “ is a second person of the Son after the Father,
 “ when he reads of the Father saying to the Son,
 “ *Let us make man &c.*^{r?}” He then quotes several
 passages, which prove the Son to be a distinct per-
 son, and continues, “ It would be too long, if I
 “ should try to bring together all passages bearing
 “ upon this point, since not only the Old but the
 “ New Testament every where proves him to have
 “ been born of the Father, *by whom all things were*
“ made, and without whom was nothing made ; who
 “ always has been and is obedient to the Father,
 “ having always power over all things, but a power

^r Sed ex hac occasione, quia Christus non homo tantum, sed et Deus, divinarum literarum sacris auctoritatibus approbat, alii hæretici erumpentes statum in Christo religionis concutere machinantur, hoc ipso Patrem Deum volentes ostendere Christum esse, dum non homo tantum asseritur, sed et Deus promittur. Sic enim, inquiunt, si unus esse Deus promittur, Christus autem Deus; ergo, inquiunt, si Pater et

Christus est unus Deus, Christus Pater dicetur. In quo errare probantur Christum non noscentes, sed sonum nominis approbantes: nolunt enim illum secundam esse personam post Patrem, sed ipsum Patrem. Quibus quia facile respondeatur, pauca dicentur. Quis enim non secundam Filii post Patrem agnoscat esse personam, cum legit dictum a Patre consequenter ad Filium, *Faciamus &c.*

“ which is delivered, which is granted, which is be-
“ stowed upon him by his own Father^s. ” I would
only observe upon this passage, that it fully con-
firms what is said in N°. 33. of the use of the word
persona.

63. *Novatiani de Trinitate*, c. 22. p. 720.

“ But because they often bring against us that
“ passage, in which it is said, *I and the Father are*
“ *one*, (John x. 30,) we shall with equal ease refute
“ them also in this. For if Christ were the Father,
“ as these heretics imagine, he ought to have said,
“ *I the Father am one*. But when he first says *I*,
“ and then introduces the Father, by saying *I and*
“ *the Father*, he separates and distinguishes his
“ own peculiar personality (i. e. the Son’s) from the
“ authority of the Father, not only as to the sound
“ of the word, but as to the order and arrangement
“ of power; when, if he had been conscious that he
“ was himself the Father, he might have said, *I the*
“ *Father*. And since he said one thing, (*unum*,)
“ let the heretics understand that he did not say
“ one person, (*unus*.) For *one*, in the neuter, sig-
“ nifies harmony of agreement, not unity in person.
“ — Then he goes on to say, *we are*, not *I am*,
“ that by these words, *I and the Father are*, he
“ might shew that there are two persons: but when
“ he says *one thing*, (*unum*,) it relates to agreement
“ and identity of opinion and union of affection, so

^s Et satis longum facio, si enius fuero omnes omnino ad hanc partem voces congregare, quandoquidem non tam veteris quam etiam novi testamenti scriptura divina ubique ostendat illum ex Patre natum, per quem facta &c. qui obedierit semper Patri et obediatur, semper habentem rerum omnium potestatem, sed qua traditam, sed qua concessam, sed qua a Patre proprio sibi indultam.

" that the Father and Son are properly one thing
 " (*unum*) by agreement, and by love, and by affection^t.

I have already considered more than once those words of our Saviour, *I and my Father are one*: and I am at present only concerned with the sense in which they were understood by the fathers. That Novatian did not extract from them the Sabellian notion of unity is demonstrable: and if he should seem to speak of an unity of counsel and will, rather than of nature or essence, we may compare the above passage with what he says of the same text in another place. " If Christ be merely a man, what is that which he says, *I and the Father are one*? For how can this be, if the Son as well is not also God, who may be said to be *one* with the Father, since he is from him, and is his Son, and is born of him, and is proved to have proceeded from him, in which way also he is God^u?" Novatian therefore considered the divi-

^t Sed quia frequenter intendunt illum nobis locum quo dictum sit, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*, et in hoc illos æque facile vincemus. Si enim erat, ut hæretici putant, Pater Christus, oportuit dicere, Ego Pater unus sum. At cum *ego* dicit, deinde Patrem infert, dicendo, *Ego et Pater*, proprietatem personæ suæ, id est Filii, a paterna auctoritate discernit atque distinguit, non tantummodo de sono nominis, sed etiam de ordine dispositæ potestatis: qui potuisset dicere, *Ego Pater*, si Patrem se esse meminisset. Et quia dixit *unum*, intelligent hæretici, quia non dixit *unus*. U-

num enim neutraliter positum societatis concordiam non unitatem personæ sonat. — Deinde adjicit dicens, *sumus*, non *sum*, ut ostenderet per hoc quod dixit, *sumus ego et Pater*, duas esse personas: *unum* autem quod ait, ad concordiam et eandem sententiam et ad ipsam charitatis societatem pertinet, ut merito *unum* sit Pater et Filius per concordiam et per amorem et per dilectionem.

^u Si homo tantummodo Christus, quid est quod ait, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*? Quomodo enim *Ego et Pater unum sumus*, si non et Deus est et Filius? qui idcirco *unum* potest dici

nity of Christ to be a natural consequence of his being the begotten Son of God: and at the end of the treatise he points out the opposite errors of Sabellianism and Unitarianism in the following remarkable words. “As well they who say that Jesus “Christ is God the Father, as they who consider “him to be a mere man, draw this hasty conclusion “as the origin and cause of their error and per-“verseness. Perceiving it to be written that *there* “*is one God*, they think that they cannot hold that “opinion in any other way, except by believing Christ “to be either a mere man, or God the Father.— “In fact, our Lord is as it were crucified between “two thieves, in the same manner that he was once “nailed to the cross, and thus receives on each side “the sacrilegious reproaches of those heretics ^x.” He then proceeds to explain his own opinion, that there is one God, and yet that Christ is God: and having said, “there is proved to be one true and “eternal God, the Father,” he adds, “from whom “alone this divine power is sent forth, and being “delivered to the Son is again by communion of “substance brought back to the Fathery:” where

dum ex ipso est, et dum Filius
ejus est, et dum ex ipso nasci-
tur, et dum ex ipso processisse
reperitur, per quod et Deus est.
c. 23. p. 722.

^x Tam enim illi, qui Jesum Christum ipsum Deum Patrem dicunt, quam etiam illi qui hominem illum tantummodo esse voluerunt, erroris sui et perver-
sitatis origenes et causas inde rapuerunt; quia cum animad-
verterent scriptum esse quod *unus sit Deus*, non aliter puta-
verunt istam tenere se posse

sententiam, nisi aut hominem tantum Christum, aut certe Deum Patrem putarent esse credendum.—Revera quasi inter duos latrones crucifigitur Dominus, quo modo fixus aliquando est, et ita excipit haereticorum istorum ex utroque latere sacrilega convitia. c. 30. p. 728.

^y A quo solo haec vis divinitatis emissâ, etiam in Filium tradita et directa, rursum per substantiæ communionem ad Patrem revolvitur. c. 31. p. 730.

the words *communion of substance* can hardly be explained in any other way, except as maintaining the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son.

DIONYSIUS ALEXANDRINUS, A. D. 260.

64. *Dionysii ex Elencho et Apologia*, p. 93.

In my former work I have given an account of the treatise written by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, in defence of his own opinions. Having illustrated the generation of the Son by the common, though inadequate, analogy of a word proceeding from the mind, he says of the Father and the Son, “The former, who sent him forth, continued and is “what he was before: and the latter, who was sent “forth, proceeded from him, and goeth every where; “and thus each is in each, though each is different “from the other, and though two, yet they are one: “for thus it was said that the Father and the Son “are one and in each other.”

65. *Dionysii ex Elencho et Apologia*, p. 93.

Dionysius had been accused of separating the Son from the Father, and of speaking of the one, as having no relation or connection with the other: to which he replies; “Each of the two names, which “I have used, is inseparable and indivisible from “the other. Thus if I mentioned the Father, by “implication I also mentioned the Son in the Fa-“ther, even before I introduced his name: or if I “introduced the name of the Son, even if I had not “mentioned the Father before, He would certainly

⁷ Ο μὲν γὰρ ἔμεινε προπέμψας, τες δύο· οὕτω γάρ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ καὶ καὶ ἔστιν οὗτος ἡν̄ ὁ δὲ ἐξέπειτη προ- ὁ Τίτος ἐν καὶ ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἐλέχθησαν πεμφθεὶς, καὶ φέρεται πανταχοῦ. εἶναι. Athanas. de Sent. Dionys. καὶ οὕτως ἔστιν ἐκάτερος ἐν ἐκατέρῳ, 23. p. 259. ἕτερος ὁν θατέρου· καὶ ἐν εἰσιν, ὅν-

“ have had his name anticipated in that of the Son: “ or if I added the Holy Ghost, at the same time I “ subjoined from whence and by whom he came. “ But these persons are not aware, that the Father, “ in his relation of Father, is not separated from “ the Son ; for the name implies union. Nor is the “ Son removed from the Father; for the name of “ Father signifies community. In their hands also “ is the Spirit, which can neither be separated from “ the person sending, nor from the person convey- “ ing it. How then, while I make use of these “ names, can I conceive that these are divided and “ altogether distinct from each other ^a? ”

Athanasius, who has preserved all these fragments, represents Dionysius as saying shortly after, “ Thus we expand the unity into the indivisible “ Trinity ; and again we sum up the undiminished “ Trinity in the unity ^b. ”

66. *Dionysii ex Elencho et Apologia*, p. 98.

The two following fragments of the same work are preserved by Basil. In the first of them it is necessary to remember, that the term *ὑπόστασις*, *hypostasis*, was sometimes used for the *nature* or *es-*

^a Τῶν ἵπ' ἐμοῦ λεχθέντων ὄνομά-
των ἔκαστον ἀχρόιστον ἔστι καὶ ἀδι-
αίρετον τοῦ πλησίου. Πατέρα εἴπον·
καὶ πρὶν ἐπαγάγαγο τὸν Τίον, ἐσήμανα
καὶ τοῦτον ἐ τῷ Πατρί. Τίον ἐπή-
γαγον· εἰ καὶ μὴ προερήκειν τὸν Πα-
τέρα, πάντως ἂν ἐν τῷ Τίῳ προε-
ληφθε. “ Αγιον Πνεῦμα προσέθηκα,
ἄλλ’ ἄμα καὶ πόθεν καὶ διὰ τίνος
ῆκεν ἐφῆρισσα. Οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἴσταιν,
ὅτι μῆτε ἀπηλλοτρίωται Πατήρ Τίον
ἢ Πατήρ προκαταρκτικὸν γάρ ἔστι
τῆς συναφείας τὸ ὄνομα· εὔτε ὁ Τίος
ἀπόκισται τοῦ Πατρός. ‘Η γάρ

Πατήρ προσηγορία δηλοῖ τὴν κοινω-
νίαν· ἐν τε ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν ἔστι
τὸ Πνεῦμα, μῆτε τοῦ πέμπτοντος,
μῆτε τοῦ φέροντος δυνάμενον στέ-
ρεθαι. Πάσι οὖν ὃ τούτοις χρόμενος
τοῖς ὄντας, μεμερίσθαι ταῦτα καὶ
ἀφωρίσθαι παντελῶς ἀλλήλων οἰο-
ματι; Athanas. l. c. 17. p. 254.

^b Οὕτω μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς τε τὴν
Τριάδα τὴν μονάδα πλατύνομεν ἀδι-
αίρετον, καὶ τὴν Τριάδα πάλιν ἀμεί-
ωτον εἰς τὴν μονάδα συγκεφαλαιού-
μεθα.

sence of the Deity; sometimes for *a person*, i. e. for the substantial individuality of the three persons in the Godhead^c. The Sabellians declined saying, in the latter sense of the term, that there were three *hypostases*; and wished to argue, that such an expression implied three distinct, unconnected Beings. Dionysius observes, “Though they may say, that “the hypostases, by being three, are divided, still “they are three, though it may not suit these persons to say so: or else let them altogether deny “the divine Trinity^d.” We may infer from this remark, that the word *Trinity* was in common use before the Sabellian controversy began: and Dionysius assumes it as an undisputed point, that in some sense or other there was a Trinity in the Godhead. The Sabellians probably denied, that the word *τριάς* implied three *ὑποστάσεις*, or distinctly existing persons: but the history of Dionysius and his writings leaves no doubt as to the body of believers maintaining this opinion.

67. *Dionysii ex Elencho et Apologia*, p. 99.

The following fragment would have been more intelligible, if the context had also been preserved; but the expressions, which have already been quoted from this writer, might prepare us for his saying, “For this reason there is also, after the unity, the “most divine Trinity^e.”

68. *Dionysii contra Paul. Samos. Quæst. IV.*

p. 230.

“When the Lamb was led, *as a sheep to the slaughter*, the Father was not separated from his

^c See my former work, No. 261. τρεῖς εἰσι, καν μὴ θέλωσιν ἡ τὴν θείαν Τριάδα παντελῶς ἀνελέτωσαν.

^d Εἰ τῷ τρεῖς εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις, μεμερισμένας εἶναι λέγουσι, τὴν μονάδα καὶ ἡ Τριάς.

“ Word of the same species with himself: the two persons are inseparable, as also the substantially existing Spirit of the Father, which was in the Son: for it was made manifest to all, that he was in him, and came upon him in the form of a dove; and the same, the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, participated in his suffering f.”

69. *Dionysii Alex. contra Paul. Samos. Quæst. IV.*

p. 232.

It is difficult to translate every word of the following passage, but the meaning of the whole cannot be mistaken. Christ is apparently speaking of himself, and says, “ I am he that exists personally and for ever, that is equal to the Father in the unalterable nature of the essence, coeternal also with the Spirit which is the Lord, to which when Ananias and Sapphira lied, because they did not lie to man, but to God, they died: for the Paraclete is God, in the same sense as the Father of Christ, coeternal with Christ g.”

We have the same expression of the Spirit being *coeternal* with Christ, αὐτοῦ εἶναι τὸ συναίδιον Πνεῦμα, at p. 236. I may also refer the reader to my former work, p. 128, 401, 404, 409, (second edition,) in which there are strong assertions of a belief in the Trinity, as held by Dionysius.

f ‘Ο Πατὴρ, ἀγαμένου τοῦ ἀμνοῦ, ὃς πρόβατον ἔπι σφαγὴν, οὐκ ἔχω-
ρισθη τῶν ὁμοειδῶν αὐτῶν Λόγου· αἱ δύν ὑποστάσεις ἀλχώριστοι, καὶ τὸ
ἐνυπόστατον τοῦ Πατρὸς Πνεῦμα, ὃ
ἥν ἐν τῷ Τίῷ. Πεφωλέρωται γὰρ
πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἦν, καὶ ἥδεν ἐν’
αὐτῶν ἐν εἰδεῖ περιστερᾶς· καὶ αὐτὸς,
κεκοινώηκε τῷ πάθει, ὃ Παράκλητος,
τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ “Ἄγιον.

g ‘Ο ἐνυπόστατος ἀεὶ ὁν Χριστὸς,
ὅ ἵσος τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀπαρά-
λακτον τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὡν, συναίδιος
καὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ Πνεύματι, ὅπερ ψευ-
σάμενος Ἀναίας καὶ Σάπφειρα, οὐκ
ἄνθρωπον ψευσάμενοι, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν,
ἔξέψυξαν· Θεὸς γὰρ ὁ Παράκλητος,
οἵς καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, συναί-
διος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

70. *Dionysii contra Paul. Samos. Quæst. VI.*

p. 245.

Dionysius alludes to the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11; but his manner of quoting and commenting upon them affords a remarkable proof of his believing the second and third persons of the Trinity to be intimately united with the first and with each other. “ It searcheth the heart and reins, “ because the Spirit, as God, knows even the deep “ things of God: as also no one knows the deep “ things of man, except the spirit of man which is “ in him. Here St. Paul evidently tells us, that the “ Holy Spirit alone knows the Father of the incarnate Word; and the Holy Spirit knows Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, because he is in Christ. For it is written, *The Father who abideth in Christ the Word, he doeth the works,* “ as also doth Christ who is in his Father. (John xiv. 10.) The Holy Ghost knoweth how the “ Father containeth the Son, and the Son the Father^{h.}”

DIONYSIUS ROMANUS, A. D. 260.

The words of Dionysius, bishop of Rome, are, if possible, still more express in favour of the Trinity, than those of his namesake of Alexandria. Only a small portion of his treatise against Sabellius has been preserved by Athanasius, from which I ex-

^h Ἐτάξει καρδίας καὶ νεφρούς, ὅτι πισθέντα Χριστὸν, τὸν Λόγον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς Θεὸς, τὸ οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Πνεύμα ἐπίσταται. ἀσπερ καὶ τὰ Χριστῷ ἐστιν" ὅτι φησιν, 'Ο Πατὴρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ τὸ ὁ μένων ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Λόγῳ, αὐτὸς πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ἐνταῦθα φανερῶς διδάσκει ὁ ἵερος Παῦλος, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον μόνον αὐτὸν οἶδε τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ ἀνθρωπισθέντος Λόγου" καὶ τὸν ἀνθρω-

πισθέντα Χριστὸν, τὸν Λόγον Ἰησοῦν, οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐστιν" ὅτι φησιν, 'Ο Πατὴρ ὁ μένων ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Λόγῳ, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ὄν ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. Οὐδὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ "Αγιον, πῶς ἐ Πατὴρ χωρεῖ τὸν Τίον, καὶ ὁ Τίος τὸν Πατέρα.

tracted so much in my former work, as related particularly to the divinity of the Son. The following quotation, which immediately precedes the other, defines the catholic doctrine of the Trinity with as much precision as Athanasius himself could have used. "It would be right for me to address myself "next to those who divide and separate and destroy "the holiest doctrine of the church of God, the "unity, into three essences and divided existences "and three Godheads. For I hear that there are "some among your teachers and preachers of the "word, who countenance this notion; who are op- "posed, as I may say, diametrically to the opinion "of Sabellius. For the blasphemy of the latter "consists in his saying, that the Son is himself the "Father, and *vice versa*: but these others preach "in a manner three Gods, dividing the holy unity "into three existences, foreign from each other, and "altogether separate: whereas the divine Word "must be united with the God of the universe; "and the Holy Ghost must reciprocally pass into "and dwell in God: in short the divine Trinity "must be summed up and brought together into "one, as a head, I mean the almighty God of the "universeⁱ." Then, after condemning the heresy of

ⁱ Εξῆς δ' ἀν εἰκότως λέγοιμι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς διαιροῦντας καὶ κατατέμνοντας καὶ ἀναιροῦντας τὸ σεμνότατον κίρυγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν μοναρχίαν, εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς. Πέπισμαι γάρ εἶναι τινας τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν κατηχούντων καὶ διδασκόντων τὸν θεῖον λόγον, ταύτης ὑφηγητὰς τῆς φρονήσεως^{οἱ} κατὰ διάμετρον, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἀντίκεινται τῇ Σαβελλίου γνώμῃ. Οἱ μὲν γάρ

βλασφημεῖ, αὐτὸν τὸν Τίον εἶναι λέγων τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἔμπαλιν^{οἱ} δὲ τρεῖς Θεοὺς τρόπον τινὰ κηρύττουσιν, εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ξένας ἀλλήλων, παντάπασι κεχωρισμένας, διαιροῦντες τὴν ὄγιαν μονάδα. Ἡνῶσθαι γάρ ἀνάγκη τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὸν θεῖον Λόγον^{οἱ} ἐμφιλοχαρεῖν δὲ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι δεῖ τὸ "Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα" ἥδη καὶ τὴν θείαν Τριάδα εἰς ἓν, ὃσπερ εἰς κορυφήν τινα (τὸν θεῖον τῶν ὅλων τὸν παντοκράτορα λέγω)

Marcion, and the notion of Christ being a creature, he continues, “ We must therefore neither divide “ the wonderful and divine unity into three God-“ heads ; nor destroy the dignity and exceeding “ greatness of the Lord by making him a creature : “ but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, “ and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy “ Ghost ; and that the Word is united with the “ God of the universe : for *I*, he says, *and the Fa-*
ther are one : (John x. 30.) and *I am in the Fa-*
ther, and the Father in me : (xiv. 10.) for thus “ both the divine Trinity, and the holy doctrine of “ the unity, will be preserved ^k.”

This remarkable passage may illustrate the different meanings, which were affixed to the word *ὑπόστασις* by ecclesiastical writers: and some persons have attempted to prove, that Dionysius of Rome differed from his namesake of Alexandria in this particular, and consequently in his notion of the Trinity. But no attempt could be more unsuccessful. Dionysius of Alexandria certainly maintained that there were three *ὑπόστασεις* in the Godhead; by which, as I have already explained, he meant that there were three persons, i. e. three distinct individualities, in the Godhead: and he maintained this against the Sabellians. Dionysius of Rome was

συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι τε καὶ συνάγε-
 σθαι πᾶσα ἀνάγκη. Athanas. de
 Decret. Syn. Nic. c. 26. p. 231.
 et apud Routh Reliq. Sacr. vol.

III. p. 179.

^k Οὗτ' ὅν καταμερίζειν χρὴ εἰς
 τρεῖς θεότητας τὴν θαυμαστὴν καὶ
 θείαν μονάδα οὔτε ποιήσει κωλύειν
 τὸ δξίωμα καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγε-
 θος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀλλὰ τεπιστευκέναι,

εἰς Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ
 εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Τίτον αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα. ἡδόσθαι
 δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ὅλον τὸν Λόγον.
 Ἔγὼ γάρ, φρσι, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν
 ἔσμεν καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ
 Πατήρ ἐν ἐμοι· οὕτω γάρ ἀν καὶ ἡ
 θεία Τριάς, καὶ τὸ ἄγιον κύριγμα
 τῆς μοναχίας διασώζειτο. Ib. p.
 182.

equally opposed to the doctrine of Sabellius, who denied the personality of the Son and Holy Ghost: but he also opposed the notion of there being three distinct, independent *ὑπόστασεις* in the Godhead: and in this he would have had the full concurrence of his namesake of Alexandria; as may be seen in all the passages, which I have adduced from his writings. It is sometimes said, that Dionysius of Alexandria used the term *ὑπόστασις* for *person*, while Dionysius of Rome used it for *substance* or *essence*, in which sense it was undoubtedly used by later writers; but in the age of these two bishops the term was always used for substantial or individual existence, in other words, for personality; and I conceive, that Dionysius of Rome meant to employ it in this sense. He only wished to guard against the notion of these three *ὑπόστασεις*, or 'persons', being separate from, and independent of, each other. In order to convey his idea of the intimate union between the three persons, he makes use of the remarkable word *ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν*, which it is almost impossible to translate, but which I have attempted to express by *reciprocally passing into*. In the fourth century, this doctrine of mutual inhabitation or permeation was expressed by the Greek term *περιχώρησις*, and by the Latin *circumincessio* or *circumincessio*; (for it is written both ways:) and Bellarmin has explained the meaning of it in a few words, "illam intimam et perfectam inhabitacionem unius " personæ in alia¹!" A fuller definition of it is given by Genebrardus, who says, "Περιχώρησις et circum- " incessio illa dici potest unio, qua unum existit in

¹ De Christo II. 5. Op. vol. I. p. 383.

“ alio, non tantum per naturæ participationem, sed
 “ etiam per plenam et intimam præsentiam. Hoc
 “ inexistentiæ, ut sic dicam, genus nostri *circumin-*
 “ *cessionem* appellant; quia per illud aliqua, quan-
 “ tumvis a se invicem absque separatione distin-
 “ guantur, in se absque confusione insunt, seque
 “ veluti immeant^m.”

I am not concerned with attempting to explain this mystery any farther: and the concluding words of bishop Bull, in his immortal Defence of the Nicene Faith, are well worthy of our consideration; “ Denique illud imprimis considerandum est, hanc “ divinarum personarum περιχώρησιν revera maxi-
 “ mum esse mysterium, quod religiose adorare po-
 “ tius, quam curiosius rimari debemusⁿ.” It will perhaps be found, that the Anti-Trinitarians have been the principal offenders against this salutary caution: and though they scoff at those, who believe in a mystery which they cannot explain, they seem to forget, that there is no less difficulty in explaining how such a mystery could have obtained general belief, if it had not been revealed, or at least if it had not been handed down, from the beginning. It is the particular object of the present work to shew that it was so handed down. That these two bishops in the third century believed and maintained the mutual indwelling of the three persons of the Trinity, can hardly be denied: and I may now refer the reader back to the first quotation in the present work, where he will find Ignatius, the

^m De Trinitate, II. p. 103. 23; IV. 4, 9; IV. 4, 10; IV.

ⁿ Def. Fid. Nic. IV. 4, 14. 4. 12; IV. 4, 13. Animadv. in He has illustrated this doctrine G. Clerke, §. 4.

in II. 4, 9; II. 9, 11; II. 9,

companion of the apostles, at the beginning of the second century, expressing ideas equally mysterious and equally inexplicable concerning the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son. So utterly unfounded is the notion, that the doctrine of the Trinity was the offspring of the fourth, or, as it is sometimes called in disparagement, the Athanasian age.

I have only to add to these extracts from the works of the two Dionysii, that the bishop of Alexandria expressly uses the term ὁμούσιος, as applied to the relation of the Father and the Son. The reader will find some remarks upon this subject in my former work, N^o. 305, which might perhaps have been more properly introduced in this place. It will also be remembered, as was stated in the same work, that Dionysius of Rome convened a council of his clergy, to consider the tenets of Sabellius: and the result of their deliberation was, that the bishop wrote the treatise, from which the preceding extract was made: so that the opposition to Sabellianism was not the act of one individual only, but of the whole Roman clergy assembled in council.

72. CONCILIJ ANTIOCHENI, A. D. 269.

This council was held about the year 269 on account of the heresy of Paul, bishop of Samosata: and at the end of the letter which was addressed to him by the assembled bishops, there is the following sentence, which may perhaps admit of different grammatical constructions, but there can be no doubt as to its maintaining the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. “ But if Christ be the *Power of God, and the Wisdom of God,* he is

“ before the worlds : so is he also, inasmuch as he “ is Christ, being one and the same in substance °.” This is perhaps almost the earliest instance of the word *οὐσία* being used for *substance* or *essence*.

THEOGNOSTUS, A. D. 283.

The testimony from Theognostus was quoted incidentally in my former work^p: and the following account of him is taken principally from Cave.

He was unquestionably a pupil of Origen, and one of his successors in the catechetical school of Alexandria : but it is uncertain, whether he followed him immediately, or whether Pierius intervened, as president of the school. Athanasius speaks of him as a man of learning^q; and we know that he composed a work in seven books, entitled *Hypotypes*, which is now lost. In the three first books he treated of the three persons of the Trinity ; and Photius, who has preserved an account of them, represents him as lowering the Son and the Holy Ghost to the rank of creatures^r. There is however good reason to conclude, that Photius was led to make this charge by his abhorrence of Origen, of whom Theognostus is acknowledged to have been a follower. Photius himself allows, that toward the end of the work he expressed himself in a more

[°] Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς Θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ Θεοῦ σοφία, πρὸ αἰώνων ἐστιν^o οὕτω καὶ καθ' Χριστὸς, ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν τῇ οὐσίᾳ. Rel. Sacr. vol. II. p. 474.

^p N^o. 305. note ^q, p. 393. ed. 2.

^q De Decret. Syn. Nic. 25.

vol. I. p. 230. ἀνὴρ λόγιος.

^r Photius, Cod. CVI. He is followed by Sandius, *Enucl. Hist. Eccl.* I. p. 109. and Huetius, *Origenian.* p. 134. He is defended by Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* II. 10, 7. &c.

orthodox manner concerning the Son : and Athanasius would never have quoted him among the Ante-Nicene testimonies to the consubstantiality of the Father and Son, if he had known him to be as heterodox, as Photius has represented him. Athanasius may perhaps lead us to the true solution of this question, when after quoting the passage, he adds, " Such are the words of Theognostus, who " after stating certain arguments by way of exer- " cise, proceeds to deliver his own opinion." *His own opinion*, if it is to be collected from his own words, can hardly be mistaken : and it is the more valuable, because Athanasius advances it as the first proof, that the fathers, who lived before the council of Nice, did not decline to speak of the Son as begotten *of the substance* of the Father. The words of Athanasius would lead us to place Theognostus earlier than Dionysius of Alexandria : but I have prefixed the date which is conjectured by Cave. The testimony of this father is as follows :

" The substance of the Son is not something
" which was extrinsic and adventitious, nor was it
" superinduced from things which once had no ex-
" istence ; but it was produced from the substance
" of the Father, like the effulgence of light, and
" the vapour of water : for the effulgence is not
" the very sun, nor the vapour the very water ;
" nor yet is it something different ; but it is an
" efflux from the substance of the Father, which
" substance did not undergo partition : for as the
" sun continues the same, and is not diminished by
" the rays which proceed from it, so neither does



"the substance of the Father undergo alteration,
"by having the Son an image of itself"."

In my former work I adduced no testimony from any writer, who flourished after the year 325, in which the first general council was held at Nice. The object of the work required me to stop at that period: but perhaps it would not have been unfair, if I had quoted from authors, who were present at the council, but who had recorded their opinions in writing before the Arian controversy began. Even Alexander himself, the bishop of Alexandria, who was the cause of the Arian doctrines being examined before a council, might be cited as a witness to the novelty of the doctrines. It is plain that he thought them contrary to those which he had received from his predecessors, or he would not have felt it his duty to punish the maintainers of them. Nor was it only the zeal of the orthodox bishop, which stepped forward to check the innovation. A council of nearly 100 bishops was assembled from Libya and Egypt, all of whom agreed in drawing up an anathema against Arius and his followers. The sentiments of Alexander may be learnt from three of his epistles, which are still extant^t. He

^s Οὐκ ἔξειθεν τίς ἐστιν ἐφευρεθεῖσα
ἡ τοῦ Τίου οὐσία, οὐδὲ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων
ἐπεισῆγθι· ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς
οὐσίας ἔφη, ὡς τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ ἀπαν-
γασμα, ὡς ὑδατος ἀτμίς· οὔτε γάρ
τὸ ἀπανγασμα, οὔτε ἡ ἀτμή, αὐτὸς
τὸ ὕδωρ ἔστιν, ἢ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος· οὔτε
ἀλλότριον, ἀλλὰ ἀπόδροια τῆς τοῦ
Πατρὸς οὐσίας, οὐ μειομότως ὑπομε-
νάσης τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας, ὡς
γάρ μένων ὁ ἥλιος ὁ αὐτὸς οὐ μειού-
ται ταῖς ἐκχεομέναις ἵπ' αὐτοῦ αὐ-

γαῖς, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ Πατρὸς
ἀλλοιώσιν ὑπέμεινεν, εἰκόνα ἔστις
ἔχουσα τὸν Τίον. Athanas. de Decret. Syn. Nic. 25. p. 230.

^t A letter to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople. (Theodoret, I. 4.) A letter to the clergy of the catholic church. (Socrat. I. 6. published more accurately *inter op.* Athanas. vol. I. p. 397.) A letter to the clergy of Alexandria and Mare-

speaks unequivocally of believing the divinity of Christ, and appeals to the consent of ancient writers upon the controverted points. The tenets of the Arians are explained with great minuteness; from which we learn, that the opposite of these tenets, the eternity of the Son, his generation by the Father, and their consubstantiality, were held by the Alexandrian bishop and his clergy as fully and unequivocally, as they were afterwards defined by his illustrious successor Athanasius. He also as plainly rejects the Sabellian interpretation, which had been put upon those passages, which speak of the unity of the Father and the Son; so that whatever may be thought of the polemical violence of the orthodox party, (and both parties were perhaps in this respect equally blameable,) it is at least certain as a matter of fact, that the Trinitarian doctrine was held by nearly all the clergy, when the controversy first began. Alexander mentions only three bishops, five presbyters, and six deacons, who supported Arius in his heresy; and without supposing these persons to have been actuated by improper motives, (a suspicion, which is more than insinuated against some of them,) it is only reasonable to decide, that the sentiments of so small a minority are not to be weighed against the deliberate declaration of the whole catholic church ^u.

There are perhaps some treatises of the great Athanasius himself, which might be quoted upon the same principle, as having been composed before

otis: (published by Coteler. Alexander may be seen in Dr. Not. ad Const. Apost. viii. 28. Randolph's Letter to the Re- and inter op. Athanas. p. 396.) marker on the Layman's Scrip-

" Some excellent remarks tural Confutation, p. 124, &c.
concerning the orthodoxy of

the appearance of the Arian controversy. Athanasius was born about the year 296, so that he was twenty-nine years old, when he attended the council of Nice: and since he was chosen bishop of Alexandria in the year immediately following the council, he must already have arrived at considerable celebrity. He had probably been known as a writer before that time: and Montfaucon, the Benedictine editor of his works, supposes two of his treatises, the *Oratio contra Gentes*, and that *de Incarnatione Verbi*, (which are perhaps parts of the same treatise,) to have been written before the commencement of the Arian heresy. The doctrine of the Trinity is frequently and explicitly maintained in both these compositions.

Eusebius is another writer, who must have distinguished himself before the time of the council of Nice, and had probably published expressions concerning the nature of Christ, before the Arian controversy had given to that subject its paramount importance. It has not however been proved, that any of his works, which are now extant, were composed before the period which I have taken as limiting these testimonies: and some persons would add, that the sentiments of Eusebius are rather to be quoted on the other side, since it is well known, that both in ancient and modern times he has been suspected of Arianism. The charge was brought formerly by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Jerome, and others; and has been repeated by Baronius, Petavius, Le Clerc, and several later writers. For a defence of Eusebius from these attacks, I would refer the reader to Cave's Dissertation, which he wrote expressly upon this subject, and to his

Apologetical Epistle^x directed against the arguments of Le Clerc. Cave has brought many passages from the writings of Eusebius, which, if they stood alone, could hardly be interpreted in any but the orthodox sense. He speaks of the divinity of Christ in terms which it would seem impossible for an Arian to have used: and yet there are other passages, from which an Arian would infer, that his own tenets had been held by Eusebius. Many instances might be brought forward in support of either opinion; but since this has been done so copiously in the works, to which I have referred, it is not necessary to repeat them. I shall only adduce one instance from the commentary upon St. Luke, which has lately been published by Angelo Mai^y, but was not known to Cave. It is upon those words in the genealogy of our Saviour, (Luke iii. 38,) where Adam is called *the Son of God*: upon which Eusebius observes, “The evangelist began the genealogy from the new Adam, and carried it up to the old. He then says, *who was the son of God*, that is, *who was from God*: for Adam has ‘no man for his father, but God formed him. You will observe also that he begins from the human nature of Christ, and then carries up the genealogy to his divinity, as much as to shew that Christ had a beginning as man, but had no beginning as God^z.’”

I have translated this passage, because it has not

^x They are both printed at the end of the Historia Literaria, in the edition of 1743.

^y Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio. Romæ, 1825. vol. I. p. 108.

^z Ὁρα δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀρξάμενος εἰς τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον τῆς γενεalogίας ἀνήγαγε, δεῖξας τὸν Χριστὸν ἡργμένον μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπον, ἀναρχον δὲ ὡς Θεόν.

yet been quoted in the controversy concerning the doctrine of Eusebius, and because the notion of Christ, “as God, having no beginning,” seems directly opposed to the Arian tenets: but on the whole I would subscribe to the observation made by Cave, who says, “It was not my intention, nor “is it now, to clear Eusebius from every imperfection: on the contrary, I have acknowledged more than once, that his writings contain many inaccurate, harsh, and dangerous expressions, which call for a fair and candid reader; and that sometimes we meet with unusual and improper forms of speech, greatly at variance with the received rules of theologians, and such as I neither approve of nor defend.” Eusebius however presented a creed or confession of faith to the council assembled at Nice, which deserves to be mentioned in this place. It would be interesting as connected with the history of that council; and if it should be thought to favour Arianism, it will be difficult to prove that the Arians did not hold the doctrine of the Trinity: but it also forms a legitimate portion of the Ante-Nicene testimony to this doctrine, when we find Eusebius speaking thus of its presentation to the council: “In the same manner that I received from the bishops my predecessors, both when I was taught my catechism, and when I was baptized; and as I have learnt from the scriptures, and according to my own belief, and the instruction which I have given as a presbyter and as a bishop, so do I now, according to my present belief, lay before you my own creed.”^a

^a Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν χήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λοιπὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηγορίᾳ, καὶ καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γρα-

Eusebius was born about the year 270: so that a creed, which he recited at his baptism, would carry us back to at least ten years before the end of the third century: and though we are not bound to suppose that this creed was actually recited word for word by Eusebius at the time of his baptism, we must at least believe that the doctrines contained in it were in accordance with those, which every catechumen was expected to profess at the end of the third century. The words of Eusebius might allow us to refer to a still earlier period. The creed is as follows:

“ I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the
 “ Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in
 “ one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of
 “ God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begot-
 “ ten Son, the first-born of every creature, begotten
 “ of God the Father before all the worlds; by whom
 “ also all things were made; who for our salvation
 “ was incarnate, and lived among men, and suffered,
 “ and rose again the third day, and returned to the
 “ Father, and will come again in glory to judge the
 “ quick and dead. I believe also in one Holy Ghost,
 “ believing that each of these has a being and exist-
 “ ence, the Father really the Father, and the Son
 “ really the Son, and the Holy Ghost really the
 “ Holy Ghost; as our Lord, when he sent his dis-
 “ ciples to preach, said, *Go and teach all nations,*
“ baptizing them in the name of the Father, and
“ of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: concerning
 “ whom I affirm, that I hold and think in this man-

φῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ σκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες τὴν πρεσβυτερίφ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπι- ἡμετέραν πίστιν ὑμῖν προσαναφέρο- σκοπῇ ἐπιστεύσαμέν τε καὶ ἐδιά- μεν. Socrat. I. 8. p. 23.

"ner, and that I long ago held thus, and shall hold
 "so until death, and persist in this faith, anathema-
 "tizing every impious heresy. I declare in the
 "presence of Almighty God, and our Lord Jesus
 "Christ, that I have held all these sentiments from
 "my heart and soul, from the time that I know
 "myself, and that I now think and express them
 "sincerely, being able to shew by demonstration,
 "and to persuade you, that my belief was thus and
 "my preaching likewise in time past ^b."

Eusebius informs us, that this creed was approved by the emperor and the council, who merely made the addition of the word ὁμοούσιος, *of one substance*. This statement is not exactly correct; though a person, who was ignorant of the Arian controversy, would scarcely observe any other material difference between the creed proposed by Eusebius, and that

^b Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἥνα Θεὸν, Πα-
 τέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάν-
 των ὄρατῶν τε καὶ ἀօράτων ποιητήν
 καὶ εἰς ἓν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν,
 τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ,
 φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Τίνον
 μανογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσῃς κτίσεως,
 πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ
 Πατρὸς γεγενημένον· δι' οὐ καὶ ἔγε-
 νετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέ-
 ραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν
 ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ πα-
 θόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ
 ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πα-
 τέρα, καὶ ἥζοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρί-
 ναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύομεν
 καὶ εἰς ἐν Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον. τούτων
 ἔκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύ-
 οντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς; Πατέρα, καὶ
 "Τίνον ἀληθῶς Τίνον, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιον
 ἀληθῶς Ἀγιον Πνεῦμα. καθὼς καὶ
 Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὰ κή-
 ρυγμα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς, εἴπε,

Πορευθέντες κ. τ. λ. περὶ δν καὶ
 διαβεβαιούμεθα, οὗτος ἔχειν, καὶ οὕ-
 τῳ φρονεῖν, καὶ πάλαι οὕτῳ ἐσχη-
 κέναι, καὶ μέχρι θανάτου οὕτῳ σχή-
 σειν, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐνίστασθαι τῇ
 πόστει, ἀναθεματίζοντες πάσαν αἰ-
 ρεσιν ἀθεον. ταῦτα ἀπὸ καρδίας καὶ
 ψυχῆς πάντα πεφρονηκέναι, ἐξ οὐπερ
 ισμεν ἑαυτῶν, καὶ νῦν φρονεῖν τε καὶ
 λέγειν ἐξ ἀληθείας, ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ
 παντοκράτορος, καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρούμεθα· δεικ-
 νύναι ἔχοντες δι' ἀποδείξεων, καὶ τεί-
 θειν ὑμᾶς, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς παρελθόντας
 χρόνους οὕτως ἐπιστεύομέν τε καὶ
 ἐκηρύσσομεν ὁμοίως. This is the
 copy of the creed as preserved by
 Socrates. It is given also
 with very few variations by
 Athanasius, (de Decret. Syn. Nic.
 p. 238.) and Theodoret, (Hist.
 Eccles. I. 12. p. 38.)

finally adopted by the council. We shall see however, that some clauses were left out, and others added: and in all these variations it is plain that the orthodox party was labouring to meet the evasions and equivocations of the Arians. The creed subscribed at Nice by nearly all the 318 bishops assembled there was as follows: and the reader will perhaps think, that this document forms a suitable termination to the series of Ante-Nicene testimony, which I have adduced to the doctrine of the Trinity.

“ We believe in one God the Father Almighty,
 “ maker of all things visible and invisible. And in
 “ one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of
 “ God, begotten of the Father, that is, of the sub-
 “ stance of the Father: God of God, Light of Light,
 “ very God of very God, begotten, not made, being
 “ of one substance with the Father; by whom^c all
 “ things were made, both things in heaven, and
 “ things on earth; who for us men and for our sal-
 “ vation came down, and was incarnate, was made
 “ man, suffered, and rose again the third day, and
 “ ascended into heaven, who is coming to judge the
 “ quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost. And
 “ those who say, there was a time when he did not
 “ exist, and that he did not exist before he was be-
 “ gotten, and that he was made out of things which
 “ were not, or who say that he was of another sub-

^c There is an ambiguity in the English version of the creed. The words *by whom* might seem to relate to the Father; but there can be no doubt, that they were intended to relate to the Son, who is invested with the

attribute of creation. If the words, *of one substance with the Father*, had not been added, there could have been no doubt as to the construction; and these words were not in the creed proposed by Eusebius.

"stance or essence, or that the Son of God is created, or liable to change, these persons the catholic and apostolical church anathematises ^d."

It will be observed, that this Creed differs in several clauses from that which is now called the Nicene Creed, and which is recited in the Communion service. These additions and alterations were made by the council, which was held at Constantinople in the year 381: and the Creed, as it was originally drawn up in Greek, may be seen in the notes ^e. It is said

^d Πιστεύμεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὄρατῶν τε καὶ αἰόρατων ποιητὴν. Καὶ εἰς [τὸν] ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ, παντεστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ δι' οὐ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [ἐν τῇ γῇ] τὸν δι' ήμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ήμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα [καὶ] σαρκωθέντα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παβόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, [καὶ] ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον [τὸ ἄγιον Πνεῦμα]. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ^fΗγ ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ, Πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, [ἢ], Οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι,] καὶ ὅτι [ἢ] οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, [τούτους] ἀναβεματίζεις ἢ [ἄγια] καθολικὴ [καὶ ἀποστολικὴ] [τοῦ Θεοῦ] ἐκκλησία. This Creed is preserved by Athanasius, de Decret. Syn. Nic. p. 239. Epist. ad Jovian. p. 781. Socrates,

Hist. Eccl. I. 8. p. 24. Theodore. *Hist. Eccl.* IV. 3. p. 151. and by other writers. The variations are unimportant, as may be seen by the words enclosed in brackets.

^e Πιστεύμεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν [οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς] ὄρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ αἰόρατων. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα [πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων], φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ δι' οὐ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. τὸν δι' ήμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ήμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα [ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν] καὶ σαρκωθέντα [ἐκ Πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ] ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, [σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ] παβόντα, [καὶ ταφέντα] καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ [κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς,] καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, [καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ [πάλιν] ἐρχόμενον [μετὰ δοξῆς] κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· [οὐ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος]. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, [τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευ-

to have been composed by Gregory, bishop of Nyssa^f. Between the two periods of the councils of Nice and Constantinople, the Macedonian heresy had sprung up, which denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and some clauses were added at the end of the Creed to exclude these opinions. It will be observed, however, that it is said of the Holy Ghost, *who proceedeth from the Father*; and the Constantinopolitan Creed was subscribed without the clause, which we now add, *and the Son*. These words never formed part of the Creed, as acknowledged by the Eastern church; nor is the procession of the Holy Ghost *from the Son*, as well as from the Father, received by the Greek church to the present day. Doubts have arisen as to the time and place, when the words *Filioque* were first added to the Latin form of the Creed, and admitted by the Western church. Some have supposed them to have been introduced by a council held at Rome at the same time with that held at Constantinople: but it is more probable, that they were not added till the following century, or perhaps considerably later.

It only remains for me to remark concerning the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, that all the clauses of it, which relate to the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, may be supported by the writings of the Ante-Nicene fathers. It has been my object in the present and former work to demon-

όμενον, τὸ σὸν Πατρὶ καὶ Τίῷ συμ-
προσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Εἰς
μίαν ὁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολι-
κὴν ἐκκλησιαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν βάπ-
τισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν· προσδο-
κῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν

τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος. Ἀμήν.] The words enclosed in brackets are those which do not appear in the Creed subscribed at Nice.

^f Niceph. *Hist. Eccles.* XII.
13.

strate this point. These clauses may be summed up in the following propositions ; that Jesus Christ had two natures, the divine and the human ; that he existed in his divine nature previous to his incarnation, and that his incarnation was the operation of the Holy Ghost ; that he was the *begotten* Son of God, and of the same substance or nature with God, and himself very God ; that his generation preceded all time, and that he was the Creator of the world. If the reader will consult the Index to this and the former work, he will find that all these points were maintained by writers who preceded the council of Nice. The doctrine, which is least clearly stated in the Constantinopolitan creed, is perhaps that which is termed in theological language, the eternal generation of the Son ; or, to express it in simpler terms, the existence of the Son from all eternity; for the words, *eternal generation*, contain in fact an assertion of two doctrines ; one, that Christ is *the begotten Son* of God; and another, that though proceeding from the Father by generation, he is still *coeternal* with Him. The fact of Christ being *the begotten Son* of God is clearly expressed in the Constantinopolitan creed ; and if his eternity should appear to be less strongly asserted, it is because the words, *before all worlds*, are not equivalent to the Greek, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων. The Socinian and Unitarian interpreters would remind us, that the term αἰώνες does not necessarily mean *worlds*, but may be translated *ages*, *periods of time*, or *dispensations*. The remark is not incorrect. Αἰών means in its primary sense *an indefinite period of time*; and in a secondary sense, *the system or scheme of things*

which continued through any period. Thus the period from the creation to the deluge was one *αιών*: from the deluge to Abraham was another: the kingdom of the Messiah is another: and so we may speak of the Mosaic dispensation as one *αιών*, and the Christian dispensation as another. But *αιῶνες* in the plural must mean more than one of these periods or dispensations: *οι αἰῶνες* might mean all the divisions of time, or all the dispensations, which ever have been or will be: and it is not difficult to see, how *οι αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων* came to be used for *eternity* by persons who considered, though erroneously, that eternity is an infinite multiple of time. When the Unitarian translators render *τοὺς αἰώνας* in Heb. i. 2. xi. 3, *the ages, or the dispensations*, though the translation would convey little meaning, it would not be incorrect, if we understand by it all the dispensations, which ever have existed; and the assertion, that Christ was the author of all these dispensations, is very remarkable: but if we compare the two passages together, the correctness of our authorized version will perhaps be apparent. If we translate the words *πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων* in the Constantinopolitan creed, *before all ages or dispensations*, they perhaps come as near to an expression of eternity, as the finite nature of language will permit. The period, which preceded creation, was as much an *αιών*, as any of those which followed it: and *πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων* can only be taken as equivalent to *before all time*, i. e. before there were any divisions of time, which can be called *αιῶνες*: and our powers of abstraction will perhaps not allow us to have a more definite idea of eternal existence than

this. It may also be remarked, that if the Constantinopolitan creed should be considered as defective in asserting the eternity of the Son, there can be no doubt as to this doctrine having been held by the writers of the three first centuries. I would again refer the reader to the Index concerning this point: and whoever consults these testimonies, will scarcely doubt what was the meaning of the creed, which speaks of the Son as *begotten before all time*.

The divinity of the Holy Ghost is asserted in the creed, by words which denote his preexistence, which give to him the titles and attributes of Deity, which separate him from created beings in the mode of his existence, and unite him as an object of worship with the Father and the Son. Concerning the latter point, I would refer to what has been said at p. 14. and the Indices will shew, as before, that the Ante-Nicene Fathers held the same sentiments concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

I should only be repeating, what has already been observed in the Introduction, if I should remind the reader, that to assert the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, is in fact to assert the doctrine of the Trinity. If each of these persons is God, we must either believe that there are three Gods, or we must believe, that though in one relation they are three, in another they are one. The latter is the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. It has not been my intention in either of these works to explain the nature of this doctrine, but merely to prove that such a doctrine was maintained in the earliest times. The reader will decide, whether this point is established by the testimonies which have been

alleged : it is for those who deny the doctrine, to explain how the church can have been in error from the beginning, and to name the period, when the Unitarian opinions were those of the universal church.

INDEX I.

TEXTS ILLUSTRATED OR REFERRED TO IN THIS WORK.

Genesis i. 26.	p. 46,	75,	119.	John	xiv. 6.	p. 91.
— 27.	p. 75.			— 10,	11.	p. 49,
iii. 22.	p. 75.			95,	127,	129.
xi. 1.	p. 92.			— 20.		p. 71.
xl ix. 9.	p. 93.			xvi. 15.		p. 80.
Exodus xix. 18.	p. 115.			xvii. 21—23.		p. 49.
Psalm xxxiv. 11.	p. 57.			— 21.		p. 90.
cxxxvi. 2.	p. 43.			Acts iv. 32.		p. 90.
Isaiah xxxv. 3—6.	p. 116.			Rom. vii. 6.		p. 103.
Micah i. 3.	p. 104.			viii. 11.		p. 94.
Habac. iii. 3.	p. 118.			ix. 5.		p. 77.
Matt. v. 48.	p. 58.			1 Cor. ii. 10,	11.	p. 127.
xxviii. 19.	p. 86,	107.		iii. 16.		p. 65.
		140.		vi. 19.		p. 65.
John i. 1.	p. 56,	71,	85.	viii. 5.		p. 43.
— 3.	p. 76,	99.		xv. 15.		p. 103.
ii. 19.	p. 104.			2 Cor. v. 19.		p. 95.
— 19—21.	p. 94.			Eph. iv. 6.		p. 52,
viii. 19.	p. 79.			Phil. ii. 7.		86.
— 42.	p. 79,	104.		Col. i. 15.		p. 105.
— 58.	p. 91.			Heb. i. 3.		p. 88.
x. 30. p. 61,	71,	80,	84,	1 John v. 7.	p. 67,	80,
90,	92,	109,	120,	95.		109.
— 38.	p. 49.			Rev. ii. 8.		p. 5.

INDEX II.

AFRICANUS, 11.
 Ἀγέρτας, 99.
 Alexander, 135.
 Alexandrian Jews, 30, 36.
 Angels, worship of, 16.
 Anicetus, 5.
 Anthems, 3.
 Ἀπίφοια, 30.
 Arians, 7. 14. 49. 135.
 Arius, 135.
 Ἀριθμός, 24. 26. 104.
 Athanasius, 136.
 Athenogenes, 11.
 Baptism, 67. 108.
 Beryllus, 92.
 Christ, before creation, 49.
 — begotten Son of God, 89.
 — of one substance with
 God, 27. 69. 89. 133.
 — perfect, 55.
 — two natures of, 3.
 — worshipped, 23. 62. 90.
 91.
 Church, belief in the, 66.
 Circumcessio, 2. 130.
 Consubstantiality, 123.
 Council of Nice, 139.
 — Constantinople, 143.
 Creed, Apostles', 66.
 — of Eusebius, 139.
 — Nicene, 142.
 Δι' οὗ, 8.
 Doxologies, 7.
 Δύναμις, 29.
 Ebionites, 46.
 Ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν, 130.
 Erasmus' Greek Testament, 113.
 Eusebius charged with Arian-
ism, 8. 137.
 — his Creed, 139.
 Evening hymn, 11.
 Facundus, 110.
 Father in the Son, 47. 55. 97.
 123, 127.
 Firmilianus, 12.
 Flavianus, 9.
 Gnostics, 48, 68, 70, 109.
 Gregory of Nyssa, 144.
 — Thaumaturgus, 12.
 Holy Ghost before creation, 50.
 — eternal, 126.
 — every where, 54.
 — not created, 89.
 — worshipped, 23, 85.
 Hours of prayer, 63.
 Hypostasis, 90, 92, 101, 124.
 Image of God, 89.
 Lucian, 31.
 Macedonian heresy, 144.
 Marcion, 6.
 Martyrdom of Ignatius, 13.
 Μεθ' οὗ, 8, 10.
 Meletius, 12.
 Montanus, 82.
 Nicene Creed, 142.
 Noëtus, 84.
 Οἰκονομία, 78, 85.
 Ὁμούσιος, 132.
 Oracles, 36.
 Ωστα, 133.
 Patripassians, 84.
 Περιχώρησις, 2, 130.
 Person, 24, 73.
 Persona, 73, 82, 120.
 Personality of the Son and Holy
 Ghost, 29, 76, 92, 98, 120,
 126.
 Plato, 36, 38.
 Præreas, 68.
 Προβολὴ, 70.
 Procession of the Holy Ghost,
 102, 144.

Πρόσωπον, 84.
Sabellianism, 24, 25, 30, 45,
68, 72, 87, 91, 92, 97, 99,
103, 117, 118, 121, 125,
128, 132, 136.
Sibylline oracles, 36.
Socinus, 32.
Son in the Father, 47, 49, 55,
97, 104, 123, 127.
Statio, 64.
Substance, 69, 123, 133.
Τριάς, 34, 83.
Tritheism, 91.

Trinity of the heathen, 36.
——— order in the, 21.
——— use of the term, 34, 82,
108, 116, 125.
——— worshipped, 44, 45, 57,
63.
Unity, 1, 49, 61, 92, 120.
Τριάσιον, 90, 92, 101, 124,
129.
Valentinus, 6.
Wisdom, 34, 46, 49.
Worship paid to the Trinity,
44, 45, 57, 63.

March, 1887.

Clarendon Press, Oxford

A SELECTION OF

BOOKS

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY

HENRY FROWDE,

AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AMEN CORNER, LONDON.

ALSO TO BE HAD AT THE
CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY, OXFORD.

[*Every book is bound in cloth, unless otherwise described.*]

LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, ORIENTAL WORKS, &c.

ANGLO-SAXON.—*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, based on the MS. Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D., Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Oxford. Edited and enlarged by Prof. T. N. Toller, M.A. (To be completed in four parts.) Parts I and II. A—HWISTLIAN. 4to. 15s. each.

CHINESE.—*A Handbook of the Chinese Language*. By James Summers. 1863. 8vo. half bound, 1l. 8s.

— *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*, by the Chinese Monk FA-HIEN. Translated and annotated by James Legge, M.A., LL.D. Crown 4to. cloth back, 10s. 6d.

ENGLISH.—*A New English Dictionary, on Historical Principles*: founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by James A. H. Murray, LL.D., with the assistance of many Scholars and men of Science. Part I. A—ANT. Part II. ANT—BATTEN. Imperial 4to. 12s. 6d. each.

— *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Second Editim. 1884. 4to. 2l. 4s.

— Supplement to the First Edition of the above. 4to. 2s. 6d.

— *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Second Edition. 1885. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

GREEK.—*A Greek-English Lexicon*, by Henry George Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. Seventh Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout. 1883. 4to. 1l. 16s.

— *A Greek-English Lexicon*, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Twenty-first Edition. 1884. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

— *A copious Greek-English Vocabulary*, compiled from the best authorities. 1850. 24mo. 3s.

— *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Second Edition. 1881. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HEBREW.—*The Book of Hebrew Roots*, by Abu 'l-Walīd Marwān ibn Janāḥ, otherwise called Rabbī Yōnāḥ. Now first edited, with an Appendix, by Ad. Neubauer. 1875. 4to. 2l. 7s. 6d.

— *A Treatise on the use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. By S. R. Driver, D.D. Second Edition. 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *Hebrew Accentuation of Psalms, Proverbs, and Job*. By William Wickes, D.D. 1881. Demy 8vo. stiff covers, 5s.

ICELANDIC.—*An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfússon, M.A. With an Introduction, and Life of Richard Cleasby, by G. Webbe Dasent, D.C.L. 1874. 4to. 3l. 7s.

— *A List of English Words the Etymology of which is illustrated by comparison with Icelandic*. Prepared in the form of an APPENDIX to the above. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. 1876. stitched, 2s.

— *An Icelandic Primer*, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *An Icelandic Prose Reader*, with Notes, Grammar and Glossary, by Dr. Guðbrand Vigfússon and F. York Powell, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LATIN.—*A Latin Dictionary*, founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D., and Charles Short, LL.D. 1879, 4to. 1l. 5s.

MELANESIAN.—*The Melanesian Languages*. By R. H. Codrington, D.D., of the Melanesian Mission. 8vo. 18s.

SANSKRIT.—*A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language*, arranged with reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the use of English Students, by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 15s.

— *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Etymologically and Philologically arranged, with special reference to Greek, Latin, German, Anglo-Saxon, English, and other cognate Indo-European Languages. By Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. 1872. 4to. 4l. 14s. 6d.

SANSKRIT.—*Nalopákhyanam*. Story of Nala, an Episode of the Mahá-Bhárata: the Sanskrit text, with a copious Vocabulary, and an improved version of Dean Milman's Translation, by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Second Edition, Revised and Improved. 1879. 8vo. 15s.

— *Sakuntalā*. A Sanskrit Drama, in Seven Acts. Edited by Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A. Second Edition, 1876. 8vo. 21s.

SYRIAC.—*Thesaurus Syriacus*: collegerunt Quatremère, Bernstein, Lorsbach, Arnoldi, Agrell, Field, Roediger: edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.P. Fasc. I-VI. 1868-83. sm. fol. each, 1l. 1s. Fasc. VII. 1l. 11s. 6d. Vol. I, containing Fasc. I-V, sm. fol. 5l. 5s.

— *The Book of Kalílah and Dimnah*. Translated from Arabic into Syriac. Edited by W. Wright, LL.D. 1884. 8vo. 21s.

GREEK CLASSICS, &c.

Aristophanes: A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 1l. 1s.

Aristotle: The Politics, with Introduction, Notes, etc., by W. L. Newman, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Vols. I. and II. *Nearly ready*.

Aristotle: *The Politics*, translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21s.

Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Sinaiticorum. Scripsit V. Gardthausen Lipsiensis. With six pages of Facsimiles. 8vo. *linen*, 25s.

Heracliti Ephesii Reliquiae. Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendix loco additae sunt Diogenis Láertii Vita Heracliti, Particulae Hippocratei De Diaeta Libri Primi, Epistolae Heracliteae. 1877. 8vo. 6s.

Herculanensium Voluminum Partes II. 1824. 8vo. 10s.

Fragmenta Herculaneia. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanean Rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited by Walter Scott, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Royal 8vo. *cloth*, 21s.

Homer: A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer; to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 1880. 4to. 1l. 1s.

— *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem*. Edited by Professor W. Dindorf, after a new collation of the Venetian MSS. by D. B. Monro, M.A., Provost of Oriel College. 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s. Vols. V and VI. *In the Press*.

— *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*. Edidit Guil. Dindorfius. Tomi II. 1855. 8vo. 15s. 6d.

Plato : Apology, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 1878. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *Philebus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 1860. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *Sophistes and Politicus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 1867. 8vo. 18s.

— *Theaetetus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *The Dialogues*, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. A new Edition in 5 volumes, medium 8vo. 1875. 3l. 10s.

— *The Republic*, translated into English, with an Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Thucydides : Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. By B. Jowett, M.A. 2 vols. 1881. Medium 8vo. 1l. 12s.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, &c.

STUDIA BIBLICA.—Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism, and kindred subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ENGLISH.—*The Holy Bible in the earliest English Versions*, made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and his followers: edited by the Rev. J. Forshall and Sir F. Madden. 4 vols. 1850. Royal 4to. 3l. 3s.

[Also reprinted from the above, with Introduction and Glossary by W. W. Skeat, M.A.

— *The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon*: according to the Wycliffite Version made by Nicholas de Hereford, about A.D. 1381, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *The New Testament in English*, according to the Version by John Wycliffe, about A.D. 1380, and Revised by John Purvey, about A.D. 1388. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.]

ENGLISH.—*The Holy Bible*: an exact reprint, page for page, of the Authorised Version published in the year 1611. Demy 4to. half bound, 1l. 1s.

— *The Psalter, or Psalms of David, and certain Canticles*, with a Translation and Exposition in English, by Richard Rolle of Hampole. Edited by H. R. Bramley, M.A., Fellow of S. M. Magdalen College, Oxford. With an Introduction and Glossary. Demy 8vo. 1l. 1s.

— *Lectures on Ecclesiastes*. Delivered in Westminster Abbey by the Very Rev. George Granville Bradley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

GOTHIC.—*The Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic*, according to the translation made by Wulfila in the Fourth Century. Edited with a Grammatical Introduction and Glossarial Index by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s.

GREEK.—*Vetus Testamentum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum*. Accedit potior varietas Codicis Alexandrini. Tomi III. Editio Altera. 18mo. 18s.

— *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive, Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Edidit Fridericus Field, A.M. 2 vols. 1875. 4to. 5l. 5s.

— *The Book of Wisdom*: the Greek Text, the Latin Vulgate, and the Authorised English Version; with an Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and a Commentary. By William J. Deane, M.A. Small 4to. 12s. 6d.

— *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in ordine parallelo dispositi. Accedit collatio Codicis Sinaiitici. Edidit E. H. Hansell, S.T.B. Tomi III. 1864. 8vo. half morocco. Price reduced to 24s.

— *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Accedunt parallela S. Scripturae loca, etc. Edidit Carolus Lloyd, S.T.P.R. 18mo. 3s.
On writing paper, with wide margin, 10s.

— *Novum Testamentum Graece* juxta Exemplar Millianum. 18mo. 2s. 6d. On writing paper, with wide margin, 9s.

— *Evangelia Sacra Graece*. Fcap. 8vo. limp, 1s. 6d.

— *The Greek Testament*, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version:—

- (1) Pica type, with Marginal References. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- (2) Long Primer type. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- (3) The same, on writing paper, with wide margin, 15s.

— *The Parallel New Testament*, Greek and English; being the Authorised Version, 1611; the Revised Version, 1881; and the Greek Text followed in the Revised Version. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

The Revised Version is the joint property of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

GREEK.—*Canon Muratorianus*: the earliest Catalogue of the Books of the New Testament. Edited with Notes and a Facsimile of the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D. 1867. 4to. 10s. 6d.

— *Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament*. By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HEBREW, etc.—*The Psalms in Hebrew without points*. 1879. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *A Commentary on the Book of Proverbs*. Attributed to Abraham Ibn Ezra. Edited from a MS. in the Bodleian Library by S. R. Driver, M.A. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

— *The Book of Tobit*. A Chaldee Text, from a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; with other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations, and the Itala. Edited by Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 1878. Crown 8vo. 6s.

— *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, a J. Lightfoot. A new Edition, by R. Gandell, M.A. 4 vols. 1859. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

LATIN.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Latina, cum Paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica*. Edidit B. Thorpe, F.A.S. 1835. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. I.* The Gospel according to St. Matthew from the St. Germain MS. (g.). Edited with Introduction and Appendices by John Wordsworth, D.D. Small 4to., stiff covers, 6s.

— *Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. II.* Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew, from the Bobbio MS. (k.), &c. Edited by John Wordsworth, D.D., W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., and H. J. White, M.A. Small 4to., stiff covers, 21s.

OLD-FRENCH.—*Libri Psalmorum Versio antiqua Gallica e Cod. MS. in Bibl. Bodleiana adservato, una cum Versione Metrica aliisque Monumentis pueretustis. Nunc primum descriptis et edidit Franciscus Michel, Phil. Doc.* 1860. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, &c.

St. Athanasius: *Historical Writings*, according to the Benedictine Text. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *Orations against the Arians*. With an Account of his Life by William Bright, D.D. 1873. Crown 8vo. 9s.

St. Augustine: *Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, and the Acts of the Second Council of Orange. With an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Canons of the First Four General Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. 1877. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils.* By William Bright, D.D. 1882. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Cyricht Archiepiscopi Alexandrini in XII Prophetas. Edidit P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi II. 1868. 8vo. cloth, 2l. 2s.

— *in D. Joannis Evangelium.* Accedunt Fragmenta varia necnon Tractatus ad Tiberium Diaconum duo. Edidit post Aubertum P. E. Pusey, A.M. Tomi III. 1872. 8vo. 2l. 5s.

— *Commentarii in Lucae Evangelium* quae supersunt Syriace. E MSS. apud Mus. Britan. edidit R. Payne Smith, A.M. 1858. 4to. 1l. 2s.

— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 2 vols. 1859. 8vo. 14s.

Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balæei, aliorumque Opera Selecta. E Codd. Syriacis MSS. in Museo Britannico et Bibliotheca Bodleiana asservatis primus edidit J. J. Overbeck. 1865. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, according to the text of Burton, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1881. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Irenæus: The Third Book of St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, against Heresies. With short Notes and a Glossary by H. Deane, B.D. 1874. Crown 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Patrum Apostolicorum, S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, quae supersunt. Edidit Guil. Jacobson, S.T.P.R. Tomi II. Fourth Edition, 1863. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Socrates' Ecclesiastical History, according to the Text of Hussey, with an Introduction by William Bright, D.D. 1878. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, &c.

Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged in parallel columns, with preface and notes. By William Maskell, M.A. Third Edition. 1882. 8vo. 15s.

Baeda Historia Ecclesiastica. Edited, with English Notes, by G. H. Moberly, M.A. 1881. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Bright (W.). Chapters of Early English Church History.
1878. 8vo. 12s.

Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England.
A new Edition. Carefully revised, and the Records collated with the originals,
by N. Pocock, M.A. 7 vols. 1865. 8vo. Price reduced to 1l. 10s.

Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain
and Ireland. Edited, after Spelman and Wilkins, by A. W. Haddan, B.D.,
and W. Stubbs, M.A. Vols. I. and III. 1869-71. Medium 8vo. each 1l. 1s.

Vol. II. Part I. 1873. Medium 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. Part II. 1878. Church of Ireland; Memorials of St. Patrick.
Stiff covers, 3s. 6d.

Hamilton (John, Archbishop of St. Andrews), The Catechism
of. Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Thomas Graves Law. With
a Preface by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Hammond (C. E.). Liturgies, Eastern and Western. Edited,
with Introduction, Notes, and Liturgical Glossary. 1878. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

An Appendix to the above. 1879. Crown 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.

John, Bishop of Ephesus. The Third Part of his Ecclesiastical History. [In Syriac.] Now first edited by William Cureton, M.A.
1853. 4to. 1l. 12s.

— Translated by R. Payne Smith, M.A. 1860. 8vo. 10s.

Leofric Missal, The, as used in the Cathedral of Exeter
during the Episcopate of its first Bishop, A.D. 1050-1072; together with some
Account of the Red Book of Derby, the Missal of Robert of Jumièges, and a
few other early MS. Service Books of the English Church. Edited, with In-
troduction and Notes, by F. E. Warren, B.D. 4to. half morocco, 35s.

Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae. The occasional
Offices of the Church of England according to the old use of Salisbury, the
Prymer in English, and other prayers and forms, with dissertations and notes.
By William Maskell, M.A. Second Edition. 1882. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

Records of the Reformation. The Divorce, 1527-1533. Mostly
now for the first time printed from MSS. in the British Museum and other libra-
ries. Collected and arranged by N. Pocock, M.A. 1870. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Shirley (W. W.). Some Account of the Church in the Apostolic
Age. Second Edition, 1874. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Stubbs (W.). Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. An attempt
to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. 1858. Small 4to.
8s. 6d.

Warren (F. E.). Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church.
1881. 8vo. 14s.

ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

Bampton Lectures, 1886. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Butler's Works, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 1874.
8vo. 11s.

Also separately,

Sermons, 5s. 6d. *Analogy of Religion, 5s. 6d*

Greswell's Harmonia Evangelica. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 1855.
9s. 6d.

Heurtley's Harmonia Symbolica: Creeds of the Western Church. 1858. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. Edited by J. Griffiths, M.A. 1859. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Hooker's Works, with his life by Walton, arranged by John Keble, M.A. Sixth Edition, 1874. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

— the text as arranged by John Keble, M.A. 2 vols. 1875. 8vo. 11s.

Jewel's Works. Edited by R. W. Jelf, D.D. 8 vols. 1848.
8vo. 1l. 10s.

Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Revised and corrected by E. Burton, D.D. Sixth Edition, 1877. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, with a Preface by the late Bishop of London. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— *Works, with Life, by Bp. Van Mildert.* A new Edition, with copious Indexes. 6 vols. 1856. 8vo. 2l. 11s.

Wheatly's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. A new Edition, 1846. 8vo. 5s.

Wyclif. A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif, by W. W. Shirley, D.D. 1865. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Select English Works.* By T. Arnold, M.A. 3 vols. 1869-1871. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

— *Trialogus.* With the Supplement now first edited. By Gotthard Lechler. 1869. 8vo. 7s.

HISTORICAL AND DOCUMENTARY WORKS.

British Barrows, a Record of the Examination of Sepulchral Mounds in various parts of England. By William Greenwell, M.A., F.S.A. Together with Description of Figures of Skulls, General Remarks on Prehistoric Crania, and an Appendix by George Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S. 1877. Medium 8vo. 25s.

Britton. A Treatise upon the Common Law of England, composed by order of King Edward I. The French Text carefully revised, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by F. M. Nichols, M.A. 2 vols. 1865. Royal 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. 7 vols. 1839. 18mo. 1l. 1s.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Also his Life, written by himself, in which is included a Continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion. With copious Indexes. In one volume, royal 8vo. 1842. 1l. 2s.

Clinton's Epitome of the Fasti Hellenici. 1851. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

— *Epitome of the Fasti Romani*. 1854. 8vo. 7s.

Corpus Poeticum Boreale. The Poetry of the Old Northern Tongue, from the Earliest Times to the Thirteenth Century. Edited, classified, and translated, with Introduction, Excursus, and Notes, by Guðbrand Vigfússon, M.A., and F. York Powell, M.A. 2 vols. 1883. 8vo. 42s.

Freeman (E. A.). History of the Norman Conquest of England; its Causes and Results. In Six Volumes. 8vo. 5l. 9s. 6d.

— *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First*. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary ("Liber Veritatum"): Selected Passages, illustrating the condition of Church and State, 1403–1458. With an Introduction by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. Small 4to. 10s. 6d.

Magna Carta, a careful Reprint. Edited by W. Stubbs, D.D. 1879. 4to. stitched, 1s.

Passio et Miracula Beati Olaui. Edited from a Twelfth-Century MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, with an Introduction and Notes, by Frederick Metcalfe, M.A. Small 4to. stiff covers, 6s.

Protests of the Lords, including those which have been expunged, from 1624 to 1874; with Historical Introductions. Edited by James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 1875. 3 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Rogers (J. E. T.). History of Agriculture and Prices in England, A.D. 1259-1793.

Vols. I and II (1259-1400). 1866. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

Vols. III and IV (1401-1582). 1881. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

Saxon Chronicles (Two of the) parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossarial Index, by J. Earle, M.A. 1865. 8vo. 16s.

Stubbs (W., D.D.). Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History, &c., delivered at Oxford 1867-1884. Demy 8vo. half-bound, 10s. 6d.

Sturlunga Saga, including the Islendinga Saga of Lawman Sturla Thordsson and other works. Edited by Dr. Gudbrand Vigfusson. In 2 vols. 1878. 8vo. 2l. 2s.

York Plays. The Plays performed by the Crafts or Mysteries of York on the day of Corpus Christi in the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. Now first printed from the unique MS. in the Library of Lord Ashburnham. Edited with Introduction and Glossary by Lucy Toulmin Smith. 8vo. 2s.

Statutes made for the University of Oxford, and for the Colleges and Halls therein, by the University of Oxford Commissioners. 1882. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Statuta Universitatis Oxoniensis. 1886. 8vo. 5s.

The Examination Statutes for the Degrees of B.A., B. Mus., B.C.L., and B.M. Revised to Hilary Term, 1887. 8vo. sewed, 1s.

The Student's Handbook to the University and Colleges of Oxford. Extra cap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Oxford University Calendar for the year 1887. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The present Edition includes all Class Lists and other University distinctions for the seven years ending with 1886.

Also, supplementary to the above, price 5s. (pp. 606),

The Honours Register of the University of Oxford. A complete Record of University Honours, Officers, Distinctions, and Class Lists; of the Heads of Colleges, &c., &c., from the Thirteenth Century to 1883.

MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

Acland (H. W., M.D., F.R.S.). Synopsis of the Pathological Series in the Oxford Museum. 1867. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

De Bary (Dr. A.). Comparative Anatomy of the Vegetative Organs of the Phanerogams and Ferns. Translated and Annotated by F. O. Bower, M.A., F.L.S., and D. H. Scott, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S. With 241 woodcuts and an Index. Royal 8vo., half morocco, 1l. 2s. 6d.

Goebel (Dr. K.). Outlines of Classification and Special Morphology of Plants. A New Edition of Sachs' Text Book of Botany, Book II. English Translation by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by I. Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. With 407 Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. half Morocco, 21s.

Lectures on the Physiology of Plants. By Julius Sachs. Translated by H. Marshall Ward, M.A. With 445 Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. Just ready.

Müller (J.). On certain Variations in the Vocal Organs of the Passers that have hitherto escaped notice. Translated by F. J. Bell, B.A., and edited, with an Appendix, by A. H. Garrod. M.A., F.R.S. With Plates. 1878. 4to. paper covers, 7s. 6d.

Price (Bartholomew, M.A., F.R.S.). Treatise on Infinitesimal Calculus.

Vol. I. Differential Calculus. Second Edition. 8vo. 14s. 6d.

Vol. II. Integral Calculus, Calculus of Variations, and Differential Equations. Second Edition, 1865. 8vo. 18s.

Vol. III. Statics, including Attractions; Dynamics of a Material Particle. Second Edition, 1868. 8vo. 16s.

Vol. IV. Dynamics of Material Systems; together with a chapter on Theoretical Dynamics, by W. F. Donkin, M.A., F.R.S. 1862. 8vo. 16s.

Pritchard (C., D.D., F.R.S.). Uranometria Nova Oxoniensis. A Photometric determination of the magnitudes of all Stars visible to the naked eye, from the Pole to ten degrees south of the Equator. 1885. Royal 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *Astronomical Observations* made at the University Observatory, Oxford, under the direction of C. Pritchard, D.D. No. 1. 1878. Royal 8vo. paper covers, 3s. 6d.

Rigaud's Correspondence of Scientific Men of the 17th Century, with Table of Contents by A. de Morgan, and Index by the Rev. J. Rigaud, M.A. 2 vols. 1841-1862. 8vo. 18s. 6d.

Rolleston (George, M.D., F.R.S.). Scientific Papers and Addresses. Arranged and Edited by William Turner, M.B., F.R.S. With a Biographical Sketch by Edward Tylor, F.R.S. With Portrait. Plates, and Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Westwood (J. O., M.A., F.R.S.). Thesaurus Entomologicus Hopeianus, or a Description of the rarest Insects in the Collection given to the University by the Rev. William Hope. With 40 Plates. 1874. Small folio, half morocco, 7l. 10s.

The Sacred Books of the East.

TRANSLATED BY VARIOUS ORIENTAL SCHOLARS, AND EDITED BY
F. MAX MÜLLER.

[Demy 8vo. cloth.]

Vol. I. The Upanishads. Translated by F. Max Müller.
Part I. The *Kṛṇodogya-upanishad*, The *Talavakāra-upanishad*, The *Aitareya-āranyaka*, The *Kaushītaki-brāhmaṇa-upanishad*, and The *Vāgasaneyi-samhitā-upanishad*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. The Sacred Laws of the Āryas, as taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāśishṭha, and Baudhāyana. Translated by Prof. Georg Bühler. Part I. Āpastamba and Gautama. 10s. 6d.

Vol. III. The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Confucianism. Translated by James Legge. Part I. The Shū King, The Religious portions of the Shih King, and The Hsiāo King. 12s. 6d.

Vol. IV. The Zend-Avesta. Translated by James Darmesteter. Part I. The Vendīdād. 10s. 6d.

Vol. V. The Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part I. The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shāyast lā-shāyast. 12s. 6d.

Vols. VI and IX. The Qur'ān. Parts I and II. Translated by E. H. Palmer. 21s.

Vol. VII. The Institutes of Vishnu. Translated by Julius Jolly. 10s. 6d.

Vol. VIII. The Bhagavadgītā, with The Sanatsugātiya, and The Anugītā. Translated by Kāshināth Trimbak Telang. 10s. 6d.

Vol. X. The Dhammapada, translated from Pāli by F. Max Müller; and The Sutta-Nipāta, translated from Pāli by V. Fausböll; being Canonical Books of the Buddhists. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XI. Buddhist Suttas. Translated from Pāli by T. W. Rhys Davids. 1. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta; 2. The Dhamma-kakka-pavattana Sutta; 3. The Tevigga Suttanta; 4. The Akaṅkheyya Sutta; 5. The Ketokhila Sutta; 6. The Mahā-sudassana Suttanta; 7. The Sabbāsavā Sutta. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XII. *The Satapatha-Brâhmaṇa*, according to the Text of the Mâdhyandina School. Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part I. Books I and II. 12s. 6d.

Vol. XIII. *Vinaya Texts*. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part I. *The Pâtimokkha. The Mahâvagga*, I-IV. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XIV. *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, as taught in the Schools of Apastamba, Gautama, Vâsishtha and Baudhâyanâ. Translated by Georg Bühler. Part II. *Vâsishtha and Baudhâyanâ*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XV. *The Upanishads*. Translated by F. Max Müller. Part II. *The Katha-upanishad, The Mundaka-upanishad, The Taittirîyaka-upanishad, The Brâhadâraṇyaka-upanishad, The Svetâsvatara-upanishad, The Prasâna-upanishad, and The Maitrâyaṇa-Brâhmaṇa-upanishad*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XVI. *The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Confucianism*. Translated by James Legge. Part II. *The Yî King*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XVII. *Vinaya Texts*. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part II. *The Mahâvagga, V-X. The Kullavagga*, I-III. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XVIII. *Pahlavi Texts*. Translated by E. W. West. Part II. *The Dâdîstân-i Dînk and The Epistles of Mânûshîhar*. 12s. 6d.

Vol. XIX. *The Fo-sho-hing-tsang-king. A Life of Buddha* by Asvaghosha Bodhisattva, translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Dharmaraksha, A.D. 420, and from Chinese into English by Samuel Beal. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XX. *Vinaya Texts*. Translated from the Pâli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg. Part III. *The Kullavagga, IV-XII*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXI. *The Saddharma-pundarîka; or, the Lotus of the True Law*. Translated by H. Kern. 12s. 6d.

Vol. XXII. *Gaina-Sûtras*. Translated from Prâkrit by Hermann Jacobi. Part I. *The Âkârâṅga-Sûtra. The Kalpa-Sûtra*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXIII. *The Zend-Avesta*. Translated by James Damsteter. Part II. *The Sirôzahs, Yasts, and Nyâyis*. 10s. 6d.

Vol. XXIV. *Pahlavi Texts*. Translated by E. W. West. Part III. *Dînâ-i Mañôg-i Khirad, Sikand-gûmânîk, and Sad-Dar*. 10s. 6d.

Second Series.

Vol. XXV. *Manu.* Translated by Georg Bühler. 21s.

Vol. XXVI. *The Satapatha-Brâhmaṇa.* Translated by Julius Eggeling. Part II. 12s. 6d.

Vols. XXVII and XXVIII. *The Sacred Books of China.*
The Texts of Confucianism. Translated by James Legge. Parts III and IV.
The *Lî Kî*, or Collection of Treatises on the Rules of Propriety, or Ceremonial
Usages. 25s.

Vols. XXIX and XXX. *The Grihya-Sûtras, Rules of Vedic
Domestic Ceremonies.* Translated by Hermann Oldenberg.

Part I (Vol. XXIX), 12s. 6d. *Just Published.*

Part II (Vol. XXX). *In the Press.*

The following Volumes are in the Press:—

Vol. XXXI. *The Zend-Avesta.* Part III. *The Yasna,*
Visparad, Âfrînagân, and Gâhs. Translated by the Rev. L. H. Mills. *Just
ready.*

Vol. XXXII. *Vedic Hymns.* Translated by F. Max Müller.
Part I.

Vol. XXXIII. *Nârada, and some Minor Law-books.*
Translated by Julius Jolly. [Preparing.]

Vol. XXXIV. *The Vedânta-Sûtras, with Saṅkara's Com-
mentary.* Translated by G. Thibaut. [Preparing.]

* * * *The Second Series will consist of Twenty-Four Volumes.*

Clarendon Press Series

I. ENGLISH, &c.

A First Reading Book. By Marie Eichens of Berlin; and edited by Anne J. Clough. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 4d.

Oxford Reading Book, Part I. For Little Children. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.

Oxford Reading Book, Part II. For Junior Classes. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 6d.

An Elementary English Grammar and Exercise Book. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

An English Grammar and Reading Book, for Lower Forms in Classical Schools. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Typical Selections from the best English Writers, with Introductory Notices. Second Edition. In 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Vol. I. Latimer to Berkeley. Vol. II. Pope to Macaulay.

Shairp (J. C., LL.D.). Aspects of Poetry; being Lectures delivered at Oxford. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Book for the Beginner in Anglo-Saxon. By John Earle, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

An Anglo-Saxon Reader. In Prose and Verse. With Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By Henry Sweet, M.A. Fourth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Second Anglo-Saxon Reader. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. *Nearly ready.*

An Anglo-Saxon Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary. By the same Author. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Old English Reading Primers; edited by Henry Sweet, M.A. I. Selected Homilies of Ælfric. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d. II. Extracts from Alfred's Orosius. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

First Middle English Primer, with Grammar and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Second Middle English Primer. Extracts from Chaucer, with Grammar and Glossary. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Principles of English Etymology. First Series. By W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. Crown 8vo. *Nearly ready.*

The Philology of the English Tongue. By J. Earle, M.A.
Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

An Icelandic Primer, with Grammar, Notes, and Glossary.
By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

An Icelandic Prose Reader, with Notes, Grammar, and Glossary.
By G. Vigfusson, M.A., and F. York Powell, M.A. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Handbook of Phonetics, including a Popular Exposition of
the Principles of Spelling Reform. By H. Sweet, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Elementarbuch des Gesprochenen Englisch. Grammatik,
Texte und Glossar. Von Henry Sweet. Extra fcap. 8vo., stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

The Ormulum; with the Notes and Glossary of Dr. R. M.
White. Edited by R. Holt, M.A. 1878. 2 vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 21s.

Specimens of Early English. A New and Revised Edition.
With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By R. Morris, LL.D., and
W. W. Skeat, M.A.

Part I. From Old English Homilies to King Horn (A.D. 1150 to A.D. 1300).
Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 9s.

Part II. From Robert of Gloucester to Gower (A.D. 1298 to A.D. 1393).
Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Specimens of English Literature, from the 'Ploughmans
Crede' to the 'Shephearde's Calender' (A.D. 1394 to A.D. 1579). With Intro-
duction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap.
8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman, in three
Parallel Texts; together with *Richard the Redeless.* By William Langland
(about 1362-1399 A.D.). Edited from numerous Manuscripts, with Preface,
Notes, and a Glossary, by W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman, by
William Langland. Edited, with Notes, by W. W. Skeat, M.A. Third
Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Chaucer. I. *The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales;* the
Knights Tale; The Nonne Prestes Tale. Edited by R. Morris, Editor of
Specimens of Early English, &c., &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— II. *The Prioresses Tale; Sir Thopas; The Monkes
Tale; The Clerkes Tale; The Squieres Tale, &c.* Edited by W. W. Skeat,
M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— III. *The Tale of the Man of Lawe; The Pardoneres
Tale; The Second Nonnes Tale; The Chanouns Yemannes Tale.* By the
same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Gamelyn, The Tale of. Edited with Notes, Glossary, &c., by
W. W. Skeat, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Minot (Laurence). Poems. Edited, with Introduction and
Notes, by Joseph Hall, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. *Nearly ready.*

Spenser's Faery Queene. Books I and II. Designed chiefly for the use of Schools. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I. Edited by R. W. Church, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

OLD ENGLISH DRAMA.

The Pilgrimage to Parnassus with The Two Parts of the Return from Parnassus. Three Comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, A.D. MDXCVII—MDCI. Edited from MSS. by the Rev. W. D. Macray, M.A., F.S.A. Medium 8vo. Bevelled Boards, Gilt top, 8s. 6d.

Marlowe and Greene. Marlowe's Tragical History of Dr. Faustus, and Greene's Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Edited by A. W. Ward, M.A. New and Enlarged Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

Marlowe. Edward II. With Introduction, Notes, &c. By O. W. Tancock, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

SHAKESPEARE.

Shakespeare. Select Plays. Edited by W. G. Clark, M.A., and W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers.

The Merchant of Venice. 1s. Macbeth. 1s. 6d.

Richard the Second. 1s. 6d. Hamlet. 2s.

Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A.

The Tempest. 1s. 6d.	Midsummer Night's Dream. 1s. 6d.
----------------------	----------------------------------

As You Like It. 1s. 6d.	Coriolanus. 2s. 6d.
-------------------------	---------------------

Julius Cæsar. 2s.	Henry the Fifth. 2s.
-------------------	----------------------

Richard the Third. 2s. 6d.	Twelfth Night. 1s. 6d.
----------------------------	------------------------

King Lear. 1s. 6d.	King John. 1s. 6d.
--------------------	--------------------

Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist; a popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism. By R. G. Moulton, M.A. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Bacon. I. Advancement of Learning. Edited by W. Aldis Wright, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— *II. The Essays.* With Introduction and Notes. By S. H. Reynolds, M.A., late Fellow of Brasenose College. *In Preparation.*

Milton. I. Areopagitica. With Introduction and Notes. By John W. Hales, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *II. Poems.* Edited by R. C. Browne, M.A. 2 vols. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d. Sold separately, Vol. I. 4s.; Vol. II. 3s.

In paper covers:—

Lycidas, 3d. L'Allegro, 3d. Il Penseroso, 4d. Comus, 6d.

Samson Agonistes, 6d.

— *III. Samson Agonistes.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by John Churton Collins. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 1s.

Bunyan. I. The Pilgrim's Progress, Grace Abounding, Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan. Edited, with Biographical Introduction and Notes, by E. Venables, M.A. 1879. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

— II. *Holy War, &c.* Edited by E. Venables, M.A. In the Press.

Clarendon. History of the Rebellion. Book VI. Edited by T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Dryden. Select Poems. Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell; Astræa Redux; Annus Mirabilis; Absalom and Achitophel; Religio Laici; The Hind and the Panther. Edited by W. D. Christie, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Addison. Selections from Papers in the Spectator. With Notes. By T. Arnold, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In ornamental Parchment, 6s.

Steele. Selections from the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian. Edited by Austin Dobson. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. In white Parchment, 7s. 6d.

Pope. With Introduction and Notes. By Mark Pattison, B.D.

— I. *Essay on Man.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

— II. *Satires and Epistles.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Parnell. The Hermit. Paper covers, 2d.

Gray. Selected Poems. Edited by Edmund Gosse. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d. In white Parchment, 3s.

— *Elegy and Ode on Eton College.* Paper covers, 2d.

Goldsmith. The Deserted Village. Paper covers, 2d.

Johnson. I. Rasselas; Lives of Dryden and Pope. Edited by Alfred Milnes, M.A. (London). Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d., or *Lives of Dryden and Pope* only, stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

— II. *Vanity of Human Wishes.* With Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A. Paper covers, 4d.

Boswell's Life of Johnson. With the Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides. Edited, with copious Notes, Appendices, and Index, by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L., Pembroke College. With Portraits and Facsimiles. 6 vols. Medium 8vo. Nearly ready.

Cowper. Edited, with Life, Introductions, and Notes, by H. T. Griffith, B.A.

— I. *The Didactic Poems of 1782, with Selections from the Minor Pieces, A.D. 1779-1783.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— II. *The Task, with Tirocinium, and Selections from the Minor Poems, A.D. 1784-1799.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Burke. Select Works. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Payne, M.A.

— I. *Thoughts on the Present Discontents; the two Speeches on America.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— II. *Reflections on the French Revolution.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— III. *Four Letters on the Proposals for Peace with the Regicide Directory of France.* Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Keats. Hyperion, Book I. With Notes by W. T. Arnold, B.A. Paper covers, 4d.

Byron. Childe Harold. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. F. Tozer, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. In white Parchment, 5s.

Scott. Lay of the Last Minstrel. Edited with Preface and Notes by W. Minto, M.A. With Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. Stiff covers, 2s. Ornamental Parchment, 3s. 6d.

— *Lay of the Last Minstrel.* Introduction and Canto I., with Preface and Notes, by the same Editor. 6d.

II. LATIN.

Rudimenta Latina. Comprising Accidence, and Exercises of a very Elementary Character, for the use of Beginners. By John Barrow Allen, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

An Elementary Latin Grammar. By the same Author. Forty-second Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A First Latin Exercise Book. By the same Author. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Second Latin Exercise Book. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Reddenda Minora, or Easy Passages, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. For the use of Lower Forms. Composed and selected by C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Anglice Reddenda, or Easy Extracts, Latin and Greek, for Unseen Translation. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Anglice Reddenda. Second Series. By the same Author. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s, *Just Published.*

Passages for Translation into Latin. For the use of Passmen and others. Selected by J. Y. Sargent, M.A. Fifth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Exercises in Latin Prose Composition; with Introduction, Notes and Passages of Graduated Difficulty for Translation into Latin. By G. G. Ramsay, M.A., LL.D. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Hints and Helps for Latin Elegiacs. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

First Latin Reader. By T. J. Nunns, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Caesar. The Commentaries (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By Charles E. Moberly, M.A.

- Part I. *The Gallic War*. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- Part II. *The Civil War*. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- The Civil War*. Book I. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Cicero. Speeches against Catilina. By E. A. Upcott, M.A., Assistant Master in Wellington College. *In the Press*.

Cicero. Selection of interesting and descriptive passages. With Notes. By Henry Walford, M.A. In three Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

- Each Part separately, limp, 1s. 6d.
- Part I. Anecdotes from Grecian and Roman History. Third Edition.
- Part II. Omens and Dreams: Beauties of Nature. Third Edition.
- Part III. Rome's Rule of her Provinces. Third Edition.

Cicero. De Senectute. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by L. Huxley, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

- Or separately, Text and Introduction, 1s. Notes 1s.

Cicero. Selected Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Cicero. Select Orations (for Schools). In Verrem I. De Imperio Gn. Pompeii. Pro Archia. Philippica IX. With Introduction and Notes by J. R. King, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Cornelius Neros. With Notes. By Oscar Browning, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Horace. Selected Odes. With Notes for the use of a Fifth Form. By E. C. Wickham, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

- Or separately, Part I. Text, 1s. Part II. Notes, 1s.

Livy. Selections (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In Parts, limp, each 1s. 6d.

- Part I. The Caudine Disaster. Part II. Hannibal's Campaign in Italy. Part III. The Macedonian War.

Livy. Books V–VII. With Introduction and Notes. By A. R. Cluer, B.A. Second Edition. Revised by P. E. Matheson, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. (In one or two vols.) 5s.

Livy. Books XXI, XXII, and XXIII. With Introduction and Notes. By M. T. Tatham, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Ovid. Selections for the use of Schools. With Introductions and Notes, and an Appendix on the Roman Calendar. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Ovid. Tristia. Book I. The Text revised, with an Introduction and Notes. By S. G. Owen, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Plautus. Captivi. Edited by W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In the Press.

Plautus. The Trinummus. With Notes and Introductions. Intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools. By C. E. Freeman, M.A., and A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Pliny. Selected Letters (for Schools). With Notes. By the late C. E. Prichard, M.A., and E. R. Bernard, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Sallust. With Introduction and Notes. By W. W. Capes, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Tacitus. The Annals. Books I-IV. Edited, with Introduction and Notes for the use of Schools and Junior Students, by H. Fumeaux. M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Terence. Andria. With Notes and Introductions. By C. E. Freeman, M.A., and A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Adelphi.* With Notes and Introductions. Intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools. By A. Sloman, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Tibullus and Propertius. Selections. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. (In one or two vols.) 6s. Just Published.

Virgil. With Introduction and Notes. By T. L. Papillon, M.A. Two vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. The Text separately, 4s. 6d.

Virgil. The Eclogues. Edited by C. S. Jerram, M.A. In two Parts. Crown 8vo. Nearly ready.

Catulli Veronensis Liber. Iterum recognovit, apparatus criticum prolegomena appendices addidit, Robinson Ellis, A.M. 1878. Demy 8vo. 16s.

— *A Commentary on Catullus.* By Robinson Ellis, M.A. 1876. Demy 8vo. 16s.

Catulli Veronensis Carmina Selecta, secundum recognitionem Robinson Ellis, A.M. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Cicero de Oratore. With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, M.A.
Book I. 1879. 8vo. 6s. Book II. 1881. 8vo. 5s.

— *Philippic Orations.* With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. Second Edition. 1879. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Cicero. Select Letters. With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 18s.

— *Select Letters.* Text. By the same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s.

— *pro Cluentio.* With Introduction and Notes. By W. Ramsay, M.A. Edited by G. G. Ramsay, M.A. 2nd Ed. Ext. fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Horace. With a Commentary. Volume I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. By Edward C. Wickham, M.A. Second Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. 12s.

— A reprint of the above, in a size suitable for the use of Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. (May also be had in two parts.)

Livy, Book I. With Introduction, Historical Examination, and Notes. By J. R. Seeley, M.A. Second Edition. 1881. 8vo. 6s.

Ovid. P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis. Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia Vetera Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendix Indice addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Persius. The Satires. With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A. Edited by Henry Nettleship, M.A. Second Edition. 1874. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Juvenal. XIII Satires. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. H. Pearson, M.A., and Herbert A. Strong, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Latin in Liverpool University College, Victoria University. In two Parts. Crown 8vo. Complete, 6s. *Just Published.*

Also separately, Part I. Introduction, Text, etc., 3s. Part II. Notes, 3s. 6d.

Tacitus. The Annals. Books I-VI. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. Furneaux, M.A. 8vo. 18s.

Nettleship (H., M.A.). Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Scholarship and Literature. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *The Roman Satura:* its original form in connection with its literary development. 8vo. sewed, 1s.

— *Ancient Lives of Vergil.* With an Essay on the Poems of Vergil, in connection with his Life and Times. 8vo. sewed, 2s.

Papillon (T. L., M.A.). A Manual of Comparative Philology. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. 1882. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Pinder (North, M.A.). Selections from the less known Latin Poets. 1869. 8vo. 15s.

Sellar (W. Y., M.A.). Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. VIRGIL. New Edition. 1883. Crown 8vo. 9s.

— *Roman Poets of the Republic.* New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1881. 8vo. 14s.

Wordsworth (J., M.A.). Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin. With Introductions and Notes. 1874. 8vo. 18s.

III. GREEK.

A Greek Primer, for the use of beginners in that Language. By the Right Rev. Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L. Seventh Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Easy Greek Reader. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

The Text and Notes may be had separately, 1s. 6d. each.

Graecae Grammaticae Rudimenta in usum Scholarum. Auctore Carolo Wordsworth, D.C.L. Nineteenth Edition, 1882. 12mo. 4s.

A Greek-English Lexicon, abridged from Liddell and Scott's 4to. edition, chiefly for the use of Schools. Twenty-first Edition. 1884. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective; their forms, meaning, and quantity; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with references to the passages in which they are found. By W. Veitch. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 1os. 6d.

The Elements of Greek Accentuation (for Schools): abridged from his larger work by H. W. Chandler, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A SERIES OF GRADUATED GREEK READERS:—

First Greek Reader. By W. G. Rushbrooke, M.L. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Second Greek Reader. By A. M. Bell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Fourth Greek Reader; being Specimens of Greek Dialects. With Introductions, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Fifth Greek Reader. Selections from Greek Epic and Dramatic Poetry, with Introductions and Notes. By Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry: being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright. M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose, being a Collection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. Wright, M.A., and J. E. L. Shadwell, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound (for Schools). With Introduction and Notes, by A. O. Prickard, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

—*Agamemnon*. With Introduction and Notes, by Arthur Sidgwick, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

—*Choephoroi*. With Introduction and Notes by the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Aristophanes. In Single Plays. Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo.

I. *The Clouds*, Second Edition, 2s.

II. *The Acharnians*, 2s. III. *The Frogs*, 2s.

Cebes. Tabula. With Introduction and Notes. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Demosthenes. Olynthiacs and Philippics. Edited by Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. In two Parts. *In the Press.*

Euripides. Alcestis (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Helena.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Iphigenia in Tauris.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, etc., for Upper and Middle Forms. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 3s.

— *Medea.* By C. B. Heberden, M.A. In two Parts. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Or separately, Part I. Introduction and Text, 1s.

Part II. Notes and Appendices, 1s.

Herodotus, Selections from. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Map, by W. W. Merry, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII (for Schools). By W. W. Merry, M.A. Twenty-seventh Thousand. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Book II, separately, 1s. 6d.

— *Odyssey*, Books XIII–XXIV (for Schools). By the same Editor. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

— *Iliad*, Book I (for Schools). By D. B. Monro, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

— *Iliad*, Books I–XII (for Schools). With an Introduction, a brief Homeric Grammar, and Notes. By D. B. Monro, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

— *Iliad*, Books VI and XXI. With Introduction and Notes. By Herbert Hailstone, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. each.

Lucian. Vera Historia (for Schools). By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Plato. Selections from the Dialogues [including the whole of the *Apology* and *Crito*]. With Introduction and Notes by John Purves, M.A., and a Preface by the Rev. B. Jowett, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Sophocles. For the use of Schools. Edited with Introductions and English Notes. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., and Evelyn Abbott, M.A. *New and Revised Edition.* 2 Vols. Extra fcap. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
Sold separately, Vol. I, Text, 4s. 6d.; Vol. II, Explanatory Notes, 6s.

Sophocles. In Single Plays, with English Notes, &c. By Lewis Campbell, M.A., and Evelyn Abbott, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp.

Oedipus Tyrannus, Philoctetes. New and Revised Edition, 2s. each.

Oedipus Coloneus, Antigone, 1s. 9d. each.

Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, 2s. each.

— *Oedipus Rex:* Dindorf's Text, with Notes by the present Bishop of St. David's. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp, 1s. 6d.

Theocritus (for Schools). With Notes. By H. Kynaston, D.D. (late Snow). Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Xenophon. Easy Selections (for Junior Classes). With a Vocabulary, Notes, and Map. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L., and C. S. Jerram, M.A. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Selections* (for Schools). With Notes and Maps. By J. S. Phillpotts, B.C.L. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Anabasis*, Book I. Edited for the use of Junior Classes and Private Students. With Introduction, Notes, etc. By J. Marshall, M.A., Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Anabasis*, Book II. With Notes and Map. By C. S. Jerram, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

— *Cyropaedia*, Books IV and V. With Introduction and Notes by C. Bigg, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Aristotle's Politics. By W. L. Newman, M.A. [*In the Press.*]

Aristotelian Studies. I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. C. Wilson, M.A. 8vo. stiff, 5s.

Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea, ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Demosthenes and Aeschines. The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. 1872. 8vo. 12s.

Head (Barclay V.). Historia Numorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics. Royal 8vo. half-bound. 2l. 2s. Just Published.

Hicks (E. L., M.A.). A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Homer. Odyssey, Books I–XII. Edited with English Notes, Appendices, etc. By W. W. Merry, M.A., and the late James Riddell, M.A. 1886. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 16s.

Homer. A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect. By D. B. Monro, M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols.

Vol. I. *Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone.* 8vo. 16s.

Vol. II. *Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes. Fragments.* 8vo. 16s.

IV. FRENCH AND ITALIAN.

Brachet's Etymological Dictionary of the French Language, with a Preface on the Principles of French Etymology. Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

— *Historical Grammar of the French Language*. Translated into English by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. Fourth Edition. Extra scap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Works by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, M.A.

Primer of French Literature. Extra scap. 8vo. 2s.

Short History of French Literature. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Specimens of French Literature, from Villon to Hugo. Crown 8vo. 9s.

MASTERPIECES OF THE FRENCH DRAMA.

Corneille's Horace. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra scap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Andrew Lang, M.A. Extra scap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Racine's Esther. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury, M.A. Extra scap. 8vo. 2s.

Beaumarchais' Le Barbier de Séville. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Austin Dobson. Extra scap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Voltaire's Mérope. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Saintsbury. Extra scap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

Mussel's On ne badine pas avec l'Amour, and Fantasio. Edited, with Prolegomena, Notes, etc., by Walter Herries Pollock. Extra scap. 8vo. 2s.

The above six Plays may be had in ornamental case, and bound in Imitation Parchment, price 12s. 6d.

Sainte-Beuve. Selections from the Causeries du Lundi. Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Quinet's Lettres à sa Mère. Selected and edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Gautier, Théophile. Scenes of Travel. Selected and Edited by George Saintsbury. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

L'Éloquence de la Chaire et de la Tribune Françaises. Edited by Paul Blouët, B.A. (Univ. Gallic.). Vol. I. French Sacred Oratory. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Edited by GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A.

Corneille's Cinna. With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Louis XIV and his Contemporaries; as described in Extracts from the best Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century. With English Notes, Genealogical Tables, &c. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Maistre, Xavier de. Voyage autour de ma Chambre. Ourika, by Madame de Duras; Le Vieux Tailleur, by MM. Erckmann-Chatrian; La Veillée de Vincennes, by Alfred de Vigny; Les Jumeaux de l'Hôtel Corneille, by Edmond About; Mésaventures d'un Écolier, by Rodolphe Töpffer. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin, and Racine's Athalie. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Molière's Les Fourberies de Scapin. With Voltaire's Life of Molière. Extra fcap. 8vo. stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Molière's Les Femmes Savantes. With Notes, Glossary, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

Racine's Andromaque, and Corneille's Le Menteur. With Louis Racine's Life of his Father. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Regnard's Le Joueur, and Brueys and Palaprat's Le Grondeur. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Sévigné, Madame de, and her chief Contemporaries, Selections from the Correspondence of. Intended more especially for Girls' Schools. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Dante. Selections from the Inferno. With Introduction and Notes. By H. B. Cotterill, B.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Tasso. La Gerusalemme Liberata. Cantos i, ii. With Introduction and Notes. By the same Editor. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

V. GERMAN.

Scherer (W.). A History of German Literature. Translated from the Third German Edition by Mrs. F. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

Max Müller. The German Classics, from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century. With Biographical Notices, Translations into Modern German, and Notes. By F. Max Müller, M.A. A New Edition, Revised, Enlarged, and Adapted to Wilhelm Scherer's 'History of German Literature,' by F. Lichtenstein. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

GERMAN COURSE. By HERMANN LANGE.

The Germans at Home; a Practical Introduction to German Conversation, with an Appendix containing the Essentials of German Grammar. Second Edition. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The German Manual; a German Grammar, Reading Book, and a Handbook of German Conversation. 8vo. 7s. 6d

Grammar of the German Language. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

German Composition; A Theoretical and Practical Guide to the Art of Translating English Prose into German. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Lessing's Laokoon. With Introduction, English Notes, etc. By A Hamann, Phil. Doc., M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell. Translated into English Verse by E. Massie, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Also, Edited by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Phil. Doc.

Becker's Friedrich der Grosse. Extra fcap. 8vo. In the Press.

Goethe's Egmont. With a Life of Goethe, &c. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

— *Iphigenie auf Tauris.* A Drama. With a Critical Introduction and Notes. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Heine's Prosa, being Selections from his Prose Works. With English Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Heine's Harzreise. With Life of Heine, Descriptive Sketch of the Harz, and Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. paper covers, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. 6d.

Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. A Comedy. With a Life of Lessing, Critical Analysis, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Nathan der Weise.* With Introduction, Notes, etc. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Schiller's Historische Skizzen; Egmont's Leben und Tod, and Belagerung von Antwerpen. With a Map. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

— *Wilhelm Tell.* With a Life of Schiller; an historical and critical Introduction, Arguments, and a complete Commentary, and Map. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *Wilhelm Tell.* School Edition. With Map. 2s.

Modern German Reader. A Graduated Collection of Extracts in Prose and Poetry from Modern German writers:—

Part I. With English Notes, a Grammatical Appendix, and a complete Vocabulary. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Part II. With English Notes and an Index. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Niebuhr's Griechische Heroen-Geschichten. Tales of Greek Heroes. Edited with English Notes and a Vocabulary, by Emma S. Buchheim. School Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2s. Stiff covers, 1s. 6d.

VI. MATHEMATICS, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, &c.

By LEWIS HENSLEY, M.A.

Figures made Easy: a first Arithmetic Book. Crown 8vo. 6d.

Answers to the Examples in Figures made Easy, together with two thousand additional Examples, with Answers. Crown 8vo. 1s.

The Scholar's Arithmetic: with Answers. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Scholar's Algebra. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Aldis (W. S., M.A.). A Text-Book of Algebra. Crown 8vo. Nearly ready.

Baynes (R. E., M.A.). Lessons on Thermodynamics. 1878. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Chambers (G. F., F.R.A.S.). A Handbook of Descriptive Astronomy. Third Edition. 1877. Demy 8vo. 28s.

Clarke (Col. A. R., C.B., R.E.). Geodesy. 1880. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Cremona (Luigi). Elements of Projective Geometry. Translated by C. Leudesdorf, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Donkin. Acoustics. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Euclid Revised. Containing the Essentials of the Elements of Plane Geometry as given by Euclid in his first Six Books. Edited by R. C. J. Nixon, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Sold separately as follows,

Books I-IV. 3s. 6d. Books I, II. 1s. 6d.

Book I. 1s.

Galton (Douglas, C.B., F.R.S.). The Construction of Healthy Dwellings. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hamilton (Sir R. G. C.), and J. Ball. Book-keeping. New and enlarged Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. limp cloth, 2s.
Ruled Exercise books adapted to the above may be had, price 2s.

Harcourt (A. G. Vernon, M.A.), and H. G. Madan, M.A. Exercises in Practical Chemistry. Vol. I. Elementary Exercises. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Maclarens (Archibald). A System of Physical Education: Theoretical and Practical. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Madan (H. G., M.A.). Tables of Qualitative Analysis. Large 4to. paper, 4s. 6d.

Maxwell (J. Clerk, M.A., F.R.S.). A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism. Second Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

— *An Elementary Treatise on Electricity.* Edited by William Garnett, M.A. Demy 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Minchin (G. M., M.A.). A Treatise on Statics with Applications to Physics. Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. Vol. I. *Equilibrium of Coplanar Forces.* 8vo. 9s. Vol. II. *Statics.* 8vo. 16s.

— *Uniplanar Kinematics of Solids and Fluids.* Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Phillips (John, M.A., F.R.S.). Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames. 1871. 8vo. 21s.

— *Vesuvius.* 1869. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Prestwich (Joseph, M.A., F.R.S.). Geology, Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical. Vol. I. Chemical and Physical. Royal 8vo. 25s.

Roach (T., M.A.). Elementary Trigonometry. Crown 8vo. *Nearly ready.*

Rolleston's Forms of Animal Life. Illustrated by Descriptions and Drawings of Dissections. New Edition. (*Nearly ready.*)

Smyth. A Cycle of Celestial Objects. Observed, Reduced, and Discussed by Admiral W. H. Smyth, R.N. Revised, condensed, and greatly enlarged by G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. 1881. 8vo. Price reduced to 12s.

Stewart (Balfour, LL.D., F.R.S.). A Treatise on Heat, with numerous Woodcuts and Diagrams. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Vernon-Harcourt (L. F., M.A.). A Treatise on Rivers and Canals, relating to the Control and Improvement of Rivers, and the Design, Construction, and Development of Canals. 2 vols. (Vol. I, Text. Vol. II, Plates.) 8vo. 21s.

— *Harbours and Docks*; their Physical Features, History, Construction, Equipment, and Maintenance; with Statistics as to their Commercial Development. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

Watson (H. W., M.A.). A Treatise on the Kinetic Theory of Gases. 1876. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Watson (H. W., D. Sc., F.R.S.), and S. H. Burbury, M.A.

I. *A Treatise on the Application of Generalised Coordinates to the Kinetics of a Material System.* 1879. 8vo. 6s.

II. *The Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism.* Vol. I. Electrostatics. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Williamson (A. W., Phil. Doc., F.R.S.). Chemistry for Students. A new Edition, with Solutions. 1873. Extra fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

VII. HISTORY.

Bluntschli (J. K.). The Theory of the State. By J. K. Bluntschli, late Professor of Political Sciences in the University of Heidelberg. Authorised English Translation from the Sixth German Edition. Demy 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.

Finlay (George, LL.D.). A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3/. 10s.

Fortescue (Sir John, Kt.). The Governance of England: otherwise called The Difference between an Absolute and a Limited Monarchy. A Revised Text. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by Charles Plummer, M.A. 8vo. half bound, 12s. 6d.

Freeman (E.A., D.C.L.). A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

George (H. B., M.A.). Genealogical Tables illustrative of Modern History. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Small 4to. 12s.

Hodgkin (T.). Italy and her Invaders. Illustrated with Plates and Maps. Vols. I—IV., A.D. 376–553. 8vo. 3/. 8s.

Kitchin (G. W., D.D.). A History of France. With numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. In Three Volumes. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. each 10s. 6d.

Vol. 1. Down to the Year 1453.

Vol. 2. From 1453–1624. Vol. 3. From 1624–1793.

Payne (E. J., M.A.). A History of the United States of America. In the Press.

Ranke (L. von). A History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century. Translated by Resident Members of the University of Oxford, under the superintendence of G. W. Kitchin, D.D., and C. W. Boase, M.A. 1875. 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 3s.

Rawlinson (George, M.A.). A Manual of Ancient History. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 14s.

Rogers (J. E. Thorold, M.A.). The First Nine Years of the Bank of England. 8vo. cloth. Just ready.

Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I. Arranged and edited by W. Stubbs, D.D. Fifth Edition. 1883. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Stubbs (W., D.D.). The Constitutional History of England, in its Origin and Development. Library Edition. 3 vols. demy 8vo. 2l. 8s. Also in 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 12s. each.

— *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History, &c., delivered at Oxford 1867-1884.* Demy 8vo. half-bound, 1os. 6d.

Wellesley. A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers of the Marquess Wellesley, K.G., during his Government of India. Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A. 1877. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Wellington. A Selection from the Despatches, Treaties, and other Papers relating to India of Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington, K.G. Edited by S. J. Owen, M.A. 1880. 8vo. 24s.

A History of British India. By S. J. Owen, M.A., Reader in Indian History in the University of Oxford. In preparation.

VIII. LAW.

Alberici Gentilis, I.C.D., I.C., De Iure Belli Libri Tres. Edidit T. E. Holland, I.C.D. 1877. Small 4to. half morocco, 21s.

Anson (Sir William R., Bart., D.C.L.). Principles of the English Law of Contract, and of Agency in its Relation to Contract. Fourth Edition. Demy 8vo. 1os. 6d.

— *Law and Custom of the Constitution.* Part I. Parliament. Demy 8vo. 1os. 6d.

Bentham (Jeremy). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Digby (Kenelm E., M.A.). An Introduction to the History of the Law of Real Property. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 1os. 6d.

Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. 18s.

Hall (W. E., M.A.). International Law. Second Ed. 8vo. 21s.

Holland (T. E., D.C.L.). The Elements of Jurisprudence. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *The European Concert in the Eastern Question*, a Collection of Treaties and other Public Acts. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor; with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation. By J. B. Moyle, B.C.L.. M.A. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 21s.

Justinian, The Institutes of, edited as a recension of the Institutes of Gaius, by Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. Second Edition, 1881. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Justinian, Select Titles from the Digest of. By T. E. Holland, D.C.L., and C. L. Shadwell, B.C.L. 8vo. 14s.

Also sold in Parts, in paper covers, as follows:—

Part I. Introductory Titles. 2s. 6d.	Part II. Family Law. 1s.
Part III. Property Law. 2s. 6d.	Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1). 3s. 6d.
	Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 2). 4s. 6d.

Lex Aquilia. The Roman Law of Damage to Property: being a Commentary on the Title of the Digest 'Ad Legem Aquilium', (ix. 2). With an Introduction to the Study of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. By Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Markby (W., D.C.L.). Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Twiss (Sir Travers, D.C.L.). The Law of Nations considered as Independent Political Communities.

Part I. On the Rights and Duties of Nations in time of Peace. A new Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 1884. Demy 8vo. 15s.

Part II. On the Rights and Duties of Nations in Time of War. Second Edition Revised. 1875. Demy 8vo. 21s.

IX. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, &c.

Bacon's Novum Organum. Edited, with English Notes, by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

— Translated by G. W. Kitchin, D.D. 1855. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Berkeley. The Works of George Berkeley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces, Annotations, and an Account of his Life and Philosophy, by Alexander Campbell Fraser, M.A. 4 vols. 1871. 8vo. 2L 18s.

The Life, Letters, &c. 1 vol. 16s.

— *Selections from.* With an Introduction and Notes. For the use of Students in the Universities. By Alexander Campbell Fraser, LL.D. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Fowler (T., D.D.). The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. Eighth Edition, with a Collection of Examples. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *The Elements of Inductive Logic*, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities. Fourth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

— *and Wilson (J. M., B.D.). The Principles of Morals* (Introductory Chapters). 8vo. boards, 3s. 6d.

— *The Principles of Morals*. Part II. (Being the Body of the Work.) 8vo. 10s. 6d. *Just Published.*

Edited by T. FOWLER, D.D.

Bacon. Novum Organum. With Introduction, Notes, &c. 1878. 8vo. 14s.

Locke's Conduct of the Understanding. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s.

Danson (J. T.). The Wealth of Households. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Green (T. H., M.A.). Prolegomena to Ethics. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Hegel. The Logic of Hegel; translated from the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Prolegomena by William Wallace, M.A. 1874. 8vo. 14s.

Lotze's Logic, in Three Books; of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

— *Metaphysic*, in Three Books; Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology. English Translation; Edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

Martineau (James, D.D.). Types of Ethical Theory. Second Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15s.

Rogers (J. E. Thorold, M.A.). A Manual of Political Economy, for the use of Schools. Third Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Smith's Wealth of Nations. A new Edition, with Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 1880. 21s.

X. ART, &c.

Head (Barclay V.). Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics. Royal 8vo. half morocco, 42s.

Hullah (John). The Cultivation of the Speaking Voice. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Ouseley (Sir F. A. Gore, Bart.). A Treatise on Harmony. Third Edition. 4to. 10s.

— *A Treatise on Counterpoint, Canon, and Fugue*, based upon that of Cherubini. Second Edition. 4to. 16s.

— *A Treatise on Musical Form and General Composition*. Second Edition. 4to. 10s.

Robinson (J. C., F.S.A.). A Critical Account of the Drawings by Michel Angelo and Raffaello in the University Galleries, Oxford. 1870. Crown 8vo. 4s.

Ruskin (John, M.A.). A Course of Lectures on Art, delivered before the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1870. 8vo. 6s.

Troutbeck (J., M.A.) and R. F. Dale, M.A. A Music Primer (for Schools). Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Tyrwhitt (R. St. J., M.A.). A Handbook of Pictorial Art. With coloured Illustrations, Photographs, and a chapter on Perspective by A. Macdonald. Second Edition. 1875. 8vo. half morocco, 18s.

Upcott (L. E., M.A.). An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Vaux (W. S. W., M.A.). Catalogue of the Castellani Collection of Antiquities in the University Galleries, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 1s.

The Oxford Bible for Teachers, containing supplementary HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE, including Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Prices in various sizes and bindings from 3s. to 2l. 5s.

Helps to the Study of the Bible, taken from the OXFORD BIBLE FOR TEACHERS, comprising Summaries of the several Books, with copious Explanatory Notes and Tables illustrative of Scripture History and the Characteristics of Bible Lands; with a complete Index of Subjects, a Concordance, a Dictionary of Proper Names, and a series of Maps. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.; 16mo. cloth, 1s.



LONDON: HENRY FROWDE,
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER,
OXFORD: CLARENDON PRESS DEPOSITORY,
116 HIGH STREET.

NOTE The DELEGATES OF THE PRESS invite suggestions and advice from all persons interested in education; and will be thankful for hints, &c. addressed to the SECRETARY TO THE DELEGATES, Clarendon Press, Oxford.



